

Scriptural Interpretation and
Community Self-Definition
in Luke-Acts and the Writings
of Justin Martyr

Susan Wendel

SUPPLEMENTS TO NOVUM TESTAMENTUM 139

BRILL

Scriptural Interpretation and Community
Self-Definition in Luke-Acts and the
Writings of Justin Martyr

Supplements to Novum Testamentum

Editors

M.M. Mitchell

Chicago

D.P. Moessner

Dubuque

Editorial Board

L. ALEXANDER, SHEFFIELD – F. BOVON, CAMBRIDGE MA

C. BREYTENBACH, BERLIN

J.K. ELLIOTT, LEEDS – C.R. HOLLADAY, ATLANTA

M.J.J. MENKEN, TILBURG – J. SMIT SIBINGA, AMSTERDAM

J.C. THOM, STELLENBOSCH – P. TREBILCO, DUNEDIN

VOLUME 139

Scriptural Interpretation and Community Self-Definition in Luke-Acts and the Writings of Justin Martyr

By

Susan J. Wendel



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2011

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Wendel, Susan J.

Scriptural interpretation and community self-definition in Luke-Acts and the writings of Justin Martyr / By Susan J. Wendel.

p. cm. — (Supplements to Novum Testamentum ; v. 139)

Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-18920-1 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Bible. N.T. Luke—Theology. 2. Bible. N.T. Acts—Theology. 3. Judaism (Christian theology)—Biblical teaching. 4. Justin, Martyr, Saint—Views on Judaism. 5. Judaism (Christian theology)—History of doctrines—Early church, ca. 30–600. 6. Bible. N.T. Luke—Relation to the Old Testament. 7. Bible. N.T. Acts—Relation to the Old Testament. 8. Bible. O.T.—Relation to Luke. 9. Bible. O.T.—Relation to Acts. 10. Justin, Martyr, Saint—Views on the Old Testament. 11. Bible. O.T.—Criticism, interpretation, etc.—History—Early church, ca. 30–600. I. Title. II. Series.

BS2589.6.J44W46 2011

230'.0415—dc22

2010051691

ISSN 0167-9732

ISBN 9789004189201

Copyright 2011 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints BRILL, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to
The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910,
Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

For Bruce, Richard, Joshua, Elizabeth, and Jason

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ix
Introduction	1
1. History of Scholarship	4
The Literary Relationship between Luke and Justin	4
Date of Writing	7
Previous Comparisons of Luke and Justin	12
The Use of Scripture in the Writings of Luke and Justin	15
2. Aims, Rationale and Plan of Study	18
Why Compare Luke and Justin?	19
“Judaism” and “Christianity”	20
Luke and the Second Century?	22
Plan of Study	23

PART ONE

AUTHORITATIVE SCRIPTURAL INTERPRETATION AND GROUP IDENTITY

Chapter One Early Jewish Exegetes and Community Identity	27
1.1 Introduction	27
1.2 Recent Studies of Early Jewish Scriptural Interpretation	28
1.3 Exegesis as a Mode of Revelatory Experience	33
1.4 Scriptural Interpretation and Community Self-Definition	44
1.5 Conclusion	78
Chapter Two Exegesis and Community Identity in the Writings of Luke and Justin	81
2.1 Introduction	81
2.2 A Common Emphasis: Scriptural Interpretation and the Christian Message	83
2.3 Authoritative Instruction and Revelatory Illumination	89

2.4	Important Differences between the Exegesis of Luke and Justin	103
2.5	Conclusion	124
Chapter Three Competing for Identity within a Greco-Roman Milieu		
		125
3.1	Introduction	125
3.2	The Jewish Scriptures in the Writings of the Early Apologists	129
3.3	Justin: Recovery of Primordial Truth	137
3.4	Luke: Competition with Jews	142
3.5	Conclusion	150
PART TWO		
THE RECIPIENTS OF SCRIPTURAL PROMISES		
Chapter Four Revelation at the End of the Age		157
4.1	Introduction	157
4.2	End-Time Revelation and Darkening in Luke-Acts	159
4.3	End-Time Revelation and Darkening in the Writings of Justin	170
4.4	Differing Configurations of Insiders and Outsiders	181
4.5	Differing Applications of the Deuteronomistic Principle	188
4.6	Conclusion	205
Chapter Five Whose Promises Are They?		207
5.1	Introduction	207
5.2	History of Scholarship	208
5.3	Abrahamic Promises	214
5.4	Isaianic Promises	235
5.5	The Promise of the Spirit	255
5.6	Conclusion	276
Conclusion		279
Bibliography		283
Index of Ancient Texts		311

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am pleased to acknowledge those who have helped me throughout the various stages of this project. I am especially indebted to the members of my dissertation committee at McMaster University who offered essential guidance during the completion of an earlier version of this study. My supervisor, Stephen Westerholm, provided wise and timely advice throughout my research. I am deeply grateful for his thorough feedback; he inspired me to think carefully and honestly about my work. The counsel of the other members of my committee, Eileen Schuller and Peter Widdicombe, was also invaluable for the completion of this study. At critical points along the way, they read drafts of the manuscript and offered penetrating comments that helped me to clarify my ideas. I also wish to express thanks to the editors of the Supplements to *Novum Testamentum* series, David Moessner and Margaret Mitchell, for their helpful suggestions for revision and for their acceptance of my monograph.

The colleagues and friends who contributed to the project while it was in the process of being transformed into a monograph also deserve recognition. David Miller and Wes Olmstead kindly read complete drafts of the manuscript and offered helpful suggestions. Autumn Essington proof-read all of the Hebrew and Greek texts with care and precision, and Rhoda Cairns generously read portions of the English text to assist me with stylistic improvements.

Most of all, I want to thank my family. My husband, Bruce, provided me with constant support, proof-read the entire manuscript, and spent several hours discussing different aspects of my research with me. Our children, Richard, Joshua, Elizabeth, and Jason, were also a continual source of encouragement and made the entire project more enjoyable. Finally, I am grateful to my parents—Elmer and Edna Lesher—who faithfully provided me with early opportunities to interpret the scriptures, even before I could read the texts myself.

INTRODUCTION

For they are contained in your scriptures, or rather not yours, but ours.
For we obey them, whereas you, though you read them, do not grasp
their spirit. (*Dial.*29.2)

In his *Dialogue with Trypho*, the second-century apologist Justin Martyr argues that non-Jewish Christ-believers represent the true people of God who possess the sacred texts of Jews. This description serves to define Christ-believers over against competing communities: as those who possess an important link with the distant past, Christ-believers can assert the superiority of their community in relation to both Jewish and non-Jewish groups. Despite his bold declaration, arguments about the privileged status of Christ-believers in relation to the Jewish scriptures did not originate with Justin; instead, these claims surfaced as part of a wider cultural phenomenon. Differing groups in the ancient world appropriated written sources from the authoritative past in order to compete for cultural primacy and recognition.¹

For the Jewish people, in particular, the scriptures of Israel² functioned as a significant source of authoritative truth. From as early as

¹ For further discussion, see David Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 17, 23–72; Robert Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* (The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 9; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 11–23; Tim Whitmarsh, *Ancient Greek Literature* (Cambridge: Polity, 2004), 20–21; Peter T. Struck, *Birth of the Symbol: Ancient Readers at the Limits of their Texts* (Princeton: PUP, 2004), 1–20; Mary Beard, “Writing and Religion: *Ancient Literacy* and the Function of the Written Word in Roman Religion” in *Literacy in the Roman World* (Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series III; ed. M. Beard et al. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1991), 35–58; Samuel K. Eddy, *The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334–31 B.C.* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961).

² Although the final, tripartite Jewish canon was not established in the Second Temple period, the concept of scripture did emerge during this era, and different Jewish groups recognized the distinct status of a core group of texts, many of which would later become canonized. I will sometimes use the designations “Mosaic law,” “written revelation,” “Jewish scriptures” or “biblical history” to refer to texts that were often regarded as authoritative during the Second Temple period (the five books of Moses, the former and latter prophets, Psalms, and some other books). At times, I will also refer to the term that a particular text uses when referring to an authoritative text, such as “Torah” or “the Law and Prophets.” For further discussion regarding the

the Persian period, the public reading of Torah fostered a sense of national identity and formed the ideological basis for community life (e.g., Ezra 7; cf. Nehemiah 8).³ In subsequent generations, the ongoing cultural significance of the Jewish scriptures led to the rise of interpreters who specialized in the reading and instruction of these sacred texts. Yet the diversity of this period also gave rise to differing views about their true meaning and relevance. Accordingly, competing forms of exegesis came to play a prominent role in articulating the identity of certain early Jewish groups. Various interpreters argued that they had access to a privileged knowledge of the scriptures and used this claim to define the boundaries of their communities. In the words of Michael Fishbane, such “exegetical illumination” became a “new mode of access to God for a new type of community—formed around teachers and the texts that they authoritatively interpret.”⁴

Within this world of diverse competing claims, the Jesus movement emerged in the first century CE as a Jewish group that, in its own way, appropriated the Jewish scriptures as a means of competing for cultural recognition. Like some other early Jewish groups, Christ-believers insisted that they alone possessed the proper understanding of the Jewish scriptures. Unlike these other communities, however, the Christ-believing group eventually came to be comprised primarily of non-Jews. Despite this difference, Christ-believers continued to characterize the Jewish scriptures as their rightful possession and to appropriate these texts as their own. How was it possible for a group of non-Jews to lay claim to the sacred texts of Jews and use these scriptures to define their community?

With the aim of exploring the answer to this question, my study compares and contrasts the way that the writings of the New Testament attributed to Luke, hereafter Luke-Acts, and the writings of the early Christian apologist Justin Martyr define the Christ-believing community

complex process of the development of canon, see J. J. Collins, “Before the Canon: Scriptures in Second Temple Judaism,” in *Old Testament Interpretation: Past, Present and Future* (ed. J. L. Mays, D. L. Petersen and K. H. Richards; Nashville: Abingdon, 1995), 225–41; cf. James C. VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

³ Carol A. Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 26; cf. Anders Runesson, *The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-Historical Study* (ConBNT 37; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001), 277.

⁴ Michael Fishbane, “From Scribalism to Rabbinism: Perspectives on the Emergence of Classical Judaism,” in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (ed. John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 445.

by describing its privileged status in relation to the Jewish scriptures. The works of these two figures serve as particularly important examples of how the practice of scriptural interpretation by the Christ-believing community took shape in the first and second centuries. Luke presents the story of Jesus, the birth of the Jesus movement, and the inclusion of non-Jews as the realization of scriptural prophecy. Justin Martyr, who wrote less than a century later, similarly attempts to depict the rise of the non-Jewish church as the fulfillment of scriptural promises. Furthermore, in their common attempt to appropriate the Jewish scriptures for the Christ-believing community, Luke and Justin both take pains to demonstrate why Christ-believers can assert that they possess a privileged relationship to these texts.

Because of their common emphasis on this theme, my comparison of Luke and Justin will explore how each author depicts the relationship between Christ-believers and the Jewish scriptures. Such an analysis will entail a detailed examination of their writings from two main vantage points: their presentation of Christ-believers as authoritative interpreters of the Jewish scriptures and their portrayal of Christ-believers as recipients of the promises therein. It will emerge from this investigation that although both Luke and Justin similarly divide between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community by asserting that Christ-believers alone possess an inspired capacity to interpret the Jewish scriptures, they do not describe insiders to their community in precisely the same way. Whereas Justin concludes that Christ-believers have become the rightful recipients of the scriptural promises that God originally made to Jews, Luke envisages an ongoing role for the Jewish people as the recipients of the promises that God pledged to Israel.

As an introduction to my comparison of the representations of scriptural interpretation in the writings of Luke and Justin, this opening section of the study will unfold in two parts. In the first part, I will survey the findings of previous studies that relate to and inform my comparison of Luke and Justin. This will include a review of scholarly positions that address the following themes in their writings: the possible dependence of the writings of Justin upon the synoptic gospels and Acts; the date of composition of their writings; the parallels between their theological ideas; and their respective treatments of the Jewish scriptures. In the second part, I will outline the aims, rationale, and overall plan of my study, including my reasons for choosing to compare Luke and Justin, and the contribution of such a comparison to scholarship on this topic.

1. HISTORY OF SCHOLARSHIP

The Literary Relationship between Luke and Justin

Scholars have long speculated about the extent to which Justin might have relied upon the synoptic gospels as a source for his writings. He frequently cites or alludes to traditions about Jesus that resemble material from the synoptic gospels,⁵ and identifies his written sources of Jesus sayings as “memoirs of the apostles,”⁶ “gospels,”⁷ or “memoirs of the apostles and their successors.”⁸ Although these descriptions of Jesus traditions suggest that Justin knew and used written texts that stand in close relationship to the synoptic gospels, some of the material that he cites differs from canonical traditions.⁹ Additionally, in many cases, Justin uses what appears to be a harmonized form of Matthew, Mark, and Luke.¹⁰ These differences between the synoptic gospels and the sources of Justin have spawned a number of divergent theories about his possible dependence upon canonical traditions.

Arthur Bellinzoni provides a survey of the varying nineteenth-century positions regarding Justin’s unusual use of material from the synoptic gospels. He notes that earlier scholars attribute Justin’s citation of variant gospel traditions to factors such as failure of memory, reliance upon extra-canonical gospels, use of pre-synoptic traditions, or dependence upon a post-synoptic gospel harmony. Within this debate, still others maintain that it is impossible to prove that Justin used

⁵ Compare, e.g., Matt 5:28; 6:1, 19–20 with *1 Apol.* 15.1, 4, 11, 15, 17; Luke 12:48b with *1 Apol.* 17.4; Luke 10:19 with *Dial.* 76.6; Luke 23:46 with *Dial.* 105.5.

⁶ See, e.g., *1 Apol.* 66.3; 67.3–4; *Dial.* 100.4; 101.3; 102.5; 103.6, 8; 104.1; 105.1, 5, 6; 106.1, 3, 4; 107.1.

⁷ As Graham N. Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 99, points out, this plural use of εὐαγγέλια (*1 Apol.* 66.3) is unusual and represents the first occurrence of the plural form of εὐαγγέλιον in Christian writings; even Irenaeus only rarely uses this plural form.

⁸ *Dial.* 103.8. Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel*, 100–1, notes that the phrase ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων in *Dial.* 103.8 suggests that Justin recognized at least four written sources—more than one of which were written by the apostles and more than one of which were written by their followers. As Stanton cautions, however, these sources do not necessarily correspond to the four canonical gospels; cf. Anette Rudolph, ‘Denn wir sind jenes Volk...’. *Die neue Gottesverehrung in Justins Dialog mit dem Juden Tryphon in historisch-theologischer Sicht* (Bonn: Borengrässer, 1999), 56–7.

⁹ *Dial.* 88.3; 106.1–2.

¹⁰ Compare, e.g., Matt 22:30 and Luke 20:35–36 with *Dial.* 81.4; Matt 13:3b–8; Mark 4:3–8; Luke 8:5–8 with *Dial.* 125.1.

sources other than the canonical gospels.¹¹ Bellinzoni himself argues that Justin depended upon harmonized material from Matthew, Mark, and Luke, but concludes that he drew upon more than one written source that combined the synoptic gospels.¹² Helmut Koester maintains that Justin read the synoptic gospels as reliable records of the life of Jesus but did not regard them as scripture. Along with a number of other scholars, he argues that Justin used the synoptic gospels as but one of many different historical sources.¹³

¹¹ A. J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* (NovTSup 17; Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1967), 1–6, 138, 140, provides the following summary of explanations for the use of variant gospel traditions in the writings of Justin: 1. Failure of memory—Karl Semisch, *Die apostolischen Denkwürdigkeiten des Märtyrers Justinus* (Hamburg, 1848), 389ff; Theodor Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Erlangen, 1888), 463–585. 2. Use of extra-canonical gospels—Carl August Credner, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften* (Halle, 1832), 266, argued that Justin relied on the *Kerygma Petrou*, a document that he thought was parallel to Tatian's *Diatessaron*, and the *Gospel of the Hebrews*. Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justin's, der Clementinischen Homilien und Marcion's* (Halle, 1850), 21f, 31–45, suggested that Justin used *Kerygma Petrou* and the *Proto-evangelium of James*. G. Volkmar, *Über Justin den Märtyrer und sein Verhältniss zu unsern Evangelien* (Zurich, 1853) argued that Justin knew a fifth canonical gospel. 3. Use of pre-synoptic traditions—Wilhelm Bousset, *Die Evangeliencitate Justins des Märtyrers in ihrem Wert für die Evangelienkritik* (Göttingen, 1891), 114–6. 4. Dependence upon a post-synoptic harmony—Moritz von Engelhardt, *Das Christenthum Justins des Märtyrers* (Erlangen, 1878), 335–40; William Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (London, 1876), 136–8; Ernst Lippelt, *Quae Fuerint Iustini Martyris ATIONMNHOMONEYMATA Quaeque Ratione Cum Forma Syro-Latina Cohaeserint* (Halle, 1901), 35. 5. Use of canonical gospels exclusively—Brooke Foss Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament* (London, 1870), 133, 148; Aloys Baldus, *Das Verhältniss Justins des Märtyrers zu unsern synoptischen Evangelien* (Munster, 1895), 98ff. See also Andrew Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century* (WUNT 169; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 211–22, 300–8.

¹² Bellinzoni, *Sayings of Jesus*, 3–4, 140, also notes that his conclusion both concurs with and modifies the earlier view that Justin used a post-synoptic gospel harmony. See also the summary and critique of this conclusion provided by Gregory, *Reception of Luke*, 213–7. Gregory argues that Bellinzoni's hypothesis is consistent with the evidence that he cites but points out that these findings do not necessarily demand this conclusion. In Gregory's view, Bellinzoni does not give adequate consideration to other explanations. In particular, Gregory notes the possibility that Justin could have drawn upon more than one "Gospel-like" source, rather than harmonized versions of the canonical gospels.

¹³ Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London: SCM, 1990), 41–2; cf. Willis A. Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr* (London: SPCK, 1965), 7, 23–8; Henry Chadwick, "Justin Martyr's Defense of Christianity," *BJRL* 47 (1964–1965): 283; Craig D. Allert, *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho* (VCSup 64; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 98–102. C. H. Cosgrove, "Justin Martyr and the Emerging Christian Canon: Observations on the Purpose and Destination of the Dialogue with Trypho,"

Although Justin frequently combines material from the synoptic gospels and, in some cases, relies more heavily upon what appears to be a Matthean source,¹⁴ scholars have often observed a close affinity between the thought of Luke and Justin. In particular, the similarities between their record of the post-resurrection appearances of Christ have led some to conclude that Justin knew and relied on both Luke and Acts (Luke 24:25–27, 36–49; Acts 1:1–11; *1 Apol.* 39.2–4; 49.5; 50.12; *Dial.* 53.5; 76.6; 106.1).¹⁵ Others recognize resemblances between the writings of Luke and Justin but argue that these only demonstrate their use of a parallel tradition, or common source, rather than Justin's direct dependence upon the writings of Luke.¹⁶

In his work on the reception history of Luke and Acts, Andrew Gregory seeks to determine the extent of Justin's literary dependence upon the writings of Luke by subscribing to a method posited by

VG 36 (1982): 209, further argues that Justin clearly affirms the inspired status of the Jewish scriptures but devalues the authority of NT writings. Charles E. Hill, "Justin and the New Testament Writings," *Studia Patristica* 30 (1997): 42–8 rightly points out, however, that Justin's "circumspect use" of the synoptic gospels and other NT sources leaves us with limited evidence for determining his view of the authority of these writings, as well their relationship to each other and to other sources.

¹⁴ Oskar Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (NovTSup 106; Leiden: Brill, 1987), 386.

¹⁵ See, e.g., Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 8–9; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (trans. James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel and Donald H. Juel; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), xxx–xxxi. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 250–1, 256–9, 361–2, argues that Justin probably read Luke and Acts and concludes that he uses a "Lukan tradition" that he may have obtained through an intermediary source.

¹⁶ J. C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting* (London: SPCK, 1961), 12–6, 28–42, asserts that Justin used neither Luke nor Acts; cf. Albrecht Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lukas* (Tübingen, 1846), 135–51, who argued, on the basis of the discrepancies between the accounts of Jesus traditions in the writings of Luke and Justin, that Justin did not use Luke's gospel. Although Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 255–9, 362, 431–2, argues that Justin probably knew and read Luke-Acts, the notable differences between their writings lead him to conclude that Justin developed his thought independently from Luke-Acts; he posits that some of the Lukan features in the writings of Justin were handed down to him via other sources. In this way, Skarsaune distinguishes between Justin's knowledge of and direct dependence upon Luke-Acts. C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–1998), 1:41–4, maintains that if Justin knew Acts "he made little use of it, and made some statements that cannot be easily harmonized with it" (44). Similarly, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 31; New York: Doubleday), 53, voices doubts about the literary dependence of Justin upon Acts.

Koester: "Literary dependence on the finished form of a text is to be identified only where the later text makes use of an element from the earlier text that can be identified as the redactional work of an earlier author/editor."¹⁷ Using this rigorous criterion, Gregory concludes that Justin drew upon Luke, either directly or indirectly, but he remains unable to verify Justin's literary dependence upon Acts. His study illustrates both the strong resemblances between the writings of Luke and Justin and the difficulties associated with determining the precise literary relationship between them.¹⁸

Gregory's study contributes to our knowledge of Justin's possible use of Luke and his seeming neglect of Acts, but he does not attempt to develop a comparison of their theology or use of the Jewish scriptures. His interest lies in determining if the writings of Justin provide evidence for his dependence upon Luke-Acts. Likewise, Helmet Koester and Arthur Bellinzoni seek to determine whether Justin depended upon Luke or Lukan traditions, but do not attempt to develop a comparison of the similarities or differences between these two authors.

Date of Writing

The ambiguities surrounding the date of Luke-Acts pose a further problem for determining the precise literary relationship between the writings of Luke and Justin. Although the majority of scholars maintain that Luke and Acts were composed in the first century, the paucity of evidence for dating these texts makes it difficult to ascertain the exact time of their composition. This led Henry Cadbury to set "extreme limits" for the range of date of the two-volume work (60 CE–150 CE). He determined the terminus a quo for this range by noting the arrival of Paul in Rome (60 CE) and the terminus ad quem from evidence of Marcion's use of Luke's gospel (150 CE).¹⁹ More recently, John T.

¹⁷ Gregory, *Reception of Luke*, 8; cf. Helmet Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* (TUGAL 65; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), 3.

¹⁸ In his analysis of the relationship between Luke and Justin, Gregory, *Reception of Luke*, 253, 263, sees only limited material that he can attribute to Lukan redaction in Justin's writings (e.g., dependence of *1 Apol.* 19.6 on Luke 18:27). He notes, however, that his criterion is limiting since it is difficult to determine if the use of a "Lukan single tradition is more likely to reflect *Luke* or any sources that may have been common to both Luke and Justin" (291).

¹⁹ Henry Cadbury, "Subsidiary Points," in *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles* (ed. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; 5 vols.; London: MacMillan, 1920–1933), 2:349–59.

Townsend has posited an even higher upper limit for the date of Acts by arguing that there is no firm evidence of allusions or direct references to Acts prior to 170 CE.²⁰

The arguments used to posit an early date for the writings of Luke are well-known and typically rest upon the following internal evidence: Luke does not mention Paul's trial or death, fails to refer to Nero's persecution of Christ-believers in Rome (64 CE), shows no awareness of Paul's letters, makes no explicit reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, and indicates that he was a travelling companion of Paul (as shown by the "we-sections" of Acts). These characteristics of Acts lead some scholars to conclude that it was written in the 60s.²¹ Others suggest, however, that Luke composed both his Gospel and Acts after 70 CE since he knows of other attempts to compile a written record of the Jesus story (Luke 1:1), depends upon the Gospel of Mark, and refers to the destruction and siege of Jerusalem (Luke 19:41–44; 21:20; cf. 13:35).²² Still others have concluded that Acts was written in

²⁰ John T. Townsend, "Date of Acts," in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (ed. Charles Talbert; New York: Crossroad, 1984), 47–62; cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:15, who observes that there are virtually no witnesses to Acts until Irenaeus. James Hardy Ropes, *The Text of Acts*, vol. 3 of *Beginnings*, clxxxvi, suggests that Justin alludes to the 'Western' text of Acts 2:17 in *Dial.* 87.6 but Pierre Prigent, *Justin et l'Ancien Testament: L'argumentation scripturaire du traité de Justin contre toutes les hérésies comme source principale du Dialogue avec Tryphon et de la Première Apologie* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1964), 144, argues that Justin does not rely upon Acts 2:17; cf. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 122–3.

²¹ See, e.g., Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 1:1–9:50* (BECNT; 2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994–1996), 1:16–8; idem, *Acts* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 25–7; cf. E. E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 57.

²² Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 273, suggests a date of 80–85 CE for Luke and Acts; Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. Howard Clark Kee; Nashville, Abingdon, 1975), 151, suggests a range of 70–90 CE; cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (AB 28, 28A; 2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1981), 1:57 and Acts, 54. I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992 [reprint]), 35, suggests that Luke was written around 70 CE; and Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922), xxix, notes a possible range from 63 CE to 100 CE. Jacob Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 17th ed. (KEK 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 86, suggests a date of 70 CE for Luke and 80–90 CE for Acts. F. Scott Spencer, *Acts* (Sheffield: SAP, 1997), 16, suggests a range of 70–100 CE for Acts. Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 2, suggests a date of 70–80 CE for Acts. For further discussion, see Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 51–5, who surveys various scholarly positions regarding the date of Luke-Acts and outlines three basic views: early date—mid-60s; intermediate date—80s; and late date—100–130s. See also Joseph B. Tyson,

the second century by arguing that the text depends upon Josephus, attempts to counter the claims of Marcion, and exhibits close affinities with the writings of second-century authors such as Justin Martyr.²³

Even though most scholars conclude that Luke-Acts was composed in the first century, over the past decade, a handful of studies have revisited the possibility that Luke-Acts was composed in the second-century. In his recent analysis of the reception of Luke, Andrew Gregory demonstrates that the earliest evidence for the use of this Gospel occurs in the writings of Marcion and Justin.²⁴ Gregory regards the reception of Acts as still more elusive, since there is no clear evidence for the use of this text prior to the time of Irenaeus.²⁵ Although Gregory concludes that the results of his study do not demand a second-century date for Luke and Acts,²⁶ others have argued that the absence of evidence for the use of these texts before the middle of the second century strengthens the hypothesis that they were not written prior to this period. For example, Joseph B. Tyson notes the lack of external references to Acts before the second half of the second century; he posits a late date for both Acts and the canonical form of Luke on the basis that “the challenge of Marcion and Marcionite Christianity” forms the most probable context for these writings.²⁷ Of particular relevance to my study is Tyson’s suggestion that Luke-Acts emphasizes the fidelity of Christ-believers to the Jewish scriptures and Christ’s fulfillment of scriptural prophecy in order to counter Marcionite claims. Since Marcion attempted to separate the Christ-believing community from its Jewish roots and heritage, Tyson argues, Luke responded by reaffirming the close connection between Christ-believers and the scriptures and traditions of Jews.²⁸ Tyson maintains that, although Luke

Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 1–23, who provides a thorough discussion of dating theories.

²³ See, e.g., Overbeck, “Ueber das Verhältniss Justins”; John Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942); O’Neill, *Theology of Acts*.

²⁴ Gregory, *Reception of Luke*, 173–292, maintains, however, that Marcion probably drew upon a recension of the Gospel of Luke that did not include all of the Lukan tradition and, as noted above, that Justin may have used Lukan sources rather than the canonical Gospel of Luke.

²⁵ Gregory, *Reception of Luke*, 293, 350–2.

²⁶ Gregory, *Reception of Luke*, 353.

²⁷ Tyson, *Marcion*, 78–131, at 78.

²⁸ Tertullian and Irenaeus accuse Marcion of excising material from the Gospel of Luke, but Tyson argues instead that Marcion used a version of this text that had material in it that was roughly equivalent to Luke 3–23, and that the author of canonical

attempts to show the continuity between the Jewish scriptures and the Christ-believing community, he simultaneously denigrates contemporary Jews and, in so doing, “underscore[s] the anti-Semitism of the ancient world.”²⁹

Other scholars suggest that certain themes in Acts address other second-century circumstances. In collaboration with Tyson, Richard I. Pervo seeks to refine the terminus a quo for Acts by analyzing its use of sources.³⁰ Besides arguing that Acts depends upon a Pauline collection (100 CE) and the writings of Josephus, Pervo suggests that Acts shares a number of important affinities with early second-century Christian writings (e.g., the Pastoral Epistles and Apostolic Fathers): the “apologetic” attempt to show the legitimacy of the Christian movement, a “clear separation from Judaism,” the emphasis upon order and structure in the church, and the exemplary conduct of Christians as citizens of the Roman Empire.³¹ From a slightly different perspective, Laura Nasrallah suggests that certain elements of Acts demonstrate that Luke engages in “the Second Sophistic,” a movement within Greek-speaking parts of the Roman Empire that sought to construct Roman identity through both resistance to and *mimesis* of ancient Greek culture.³² Nasrallah argues that Luke’s use of the LXX, his presentation of the geographical expansion of the Christ-believing movement, and his depiction of the journeys of Paul illustrate how the book of Acts imitates Greek ways and practices.³³ In her view, the points of similarity between the trends of the Second Sophistic and Acts sup-

Luke added material to this pre-Marcionite gospel (Luke 1:1–4; 1:5–2:52; 24:13–53). Tyson holds that these additions to Luke 3–23 address the claims of Marcion by demonstrating the close relationship of Jesus to Israel, the God of Israel, and the Jewish scriptures.

²⁹ Tyson, *Marcion*, 59–60, 125–31, at 59.

³⁰ Tyson and Pervo build on the work of each other in the Westar Institute’s “Acts Seminar” in a common attempt to revive the older hypothesis of a late date for Acts.

³¹ Richard I. Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2006), 201–308, at 256.

³² Laura Nasrallah, “The Acts of the Apostles, Greek Cities, and Hadrian’s Panhellenion,” *JBL* 127 (2008): 533–66. For further discussion regarding the concept of “Second Sophistic” in ancient contexts and modern scholarship, see Tim Whitmarsh, *The Second Sophistic* (Oxford: OUP, 2005), 1–15. Notably, Nasrallah also reads the work of Justin in a similar light. See Laura Nasrallah, “Mapping the World: Justin, Tatian, Lucian, and the Second Sophistic,” *HTR* 98 (2005): 283–314.

³³ For Nasrallah, “Acts,” 552–66, Acts 17 serves as an especially important example because of the way that Paul draws upon the literature and rhetoric of ancient Greece in order to proclaim his universal message: the imperial God of Paul commands all people everywhere to repent and submit to his lordship.

port the conclusion that it was written in the second century. Thus, although they nuance their arguments in different ways, these recent studies conclude that Acts, or Luke-Acts, was composed in the second century because it expresses concerns that were prominent during this period.

Less uncertainty surrounds the date of the writings of Justin. Scholars generally agree that Justin wrote the *Apologies* around 150–155 CE and produced the final form of the *Dialogue with Trypho* at a slightly later date (~ 155–160 CE).³⁴ Although some point out the various textual difficulties in his extant writings,³⁵ discuss the complex relationship between the first and second *Apologies*,³⁶ and note the disparity between the date and setting that Justin ascribes to the *Dialogue* (Ephesus, 135 CE) and the probable date of its composition,³⁷ these issues do not have a significant impact on the range of date for

³⁴ See, e.g., Rudolph, *Denn wir sind jenes Volk*, 19–20; Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 9; L. W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (Cambridge, 1967), 23–4; Eric Francis Osborn, *Justin Martyr* (BHT 47; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1973), 8; Chadwick, “Defense,” 278.

³⁵ For summaries of the relevant evidence and scholarly discussion, see Miraslov Marcovich, ed., *Iustini Martyris Apologiae pro Christianis* (PTS 38; New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1994), 1–11; idem, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* (PTS 47; New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1997), 1–7. See also the more recent work of Denis Minns and Paul Parvis, *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies* (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 44, who suggest a date of ~147–154 CE for the *Apologies*; cf. A. von Harnack, *Die Chronologie der Litteratur bis Irenaus* (Leipzig, 1897), 227.

³⁶ For a recent summary and discussion of this issue, see Paul Parvis, “Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: The Posthumous Creation of the Second Apology,” *Justin Martyr and His Worlds* (Augsburg: Fortress, 2007), 22–37.

³⁷ There is considerable debate surrounding the issue of whether the *Dialogue* represents a genuine dialogue between Justin and Trypho. Some suggest that an actual debate took place around 135 CE that was recorded but later revised and expanded. See, e.g., Chadwick, “Defense,” 280, and Samuel Krauss, *The Jewish-Christian Controversy: From the Earliest Times to 1789* (edited and revised by William Horbury; J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995), 104. Eusebius identifies Trypho as a prominent Jew and some have tried to associate him with “Rabbi Tarfon” (e.g., E. Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. 3 vols. [Leipzig, 1901–1909], 2:375, 555–6; B. J. Kidd, *History of the Church* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1922], 1:90). Others oppose this view. See e.g., Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923), 91–5; Niels Hyldahl, “Tryphon and Tarphon,” *StTh* (1956): 77–88; and Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 24–5. Some also argue that the tone of the *Dialogue* is so vitriolic that a true exchange would have been impossible. See, e.g., Tessa Rajak, “Talking at Trypho,” in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (Oxford: OUP, 1999), 73, and M. Hirshman, *A Rivalry of Genius: Jewish and Christian Biblical Interpretation in Late Antiquity* (trans. Batya Stein; New York: State University of New York Press, 1996), 34–41. Although Goodenough argues that Trypho is, at least in part, the creation of Justin, he suggests that Trypho nevertheless represents authentic Jewish opposition to Christian claims; cf. Judith M.

his writings; the proposed dates for the *Apologies* and the *Dialogue* fit within a relatively limited time span (~135–160 CE).

If we accept a late date for the canonical form of Luke and Acts, these writings would probably not have served as a source for Justin as much as they represent the thought of an author who was contemporaneous with him. Alternatively, if Luke-Acts was written prior to the close of the first century, Justin may have had access to this text as a source of information about Jesus and the early church.

Previous Comparisons of Luke and Justin

Whereas some scholars attempt to address questions surrounding the genealogical, or literary, relationship between Luke and Justin, the work of others, such as F. Overbeck,³⁸ J. C. O'Neill,³⁹ N. Hyldahl,⁴⁰ Oskar Skarsaune,⁴¹ and William Kurz⁴² focus upon the commonalities between their theological viewpoints. Some of these comparative studies, moreover, conclude that the theological affinities between the writings of Luke and Justin show that Luke wrote in the second century. In a lengthy article that compares the writings of Justin with Acts, Overbeck concludes that both Luke and Justin wrote from the same second-century perspective of "Heidenchristenthum," which had abandoned its Jewish roots.⁴³ Furthermore, he argues that Acts was the immediate forerunner to second-century Christian apologetic literature because it expresses

Lieu, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century* (London, T&T Clark, 1996), 104.

³⁸ F. Overbeck, "Ueber das Verhältniss Justins des Martyrers zur Apg," ZWT 15 (Leipzig, 1872): 305–49.

³⁹ O'Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 10–53.

⁴⁰ Niels Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christendom: Eine Interpretation der Einleitung zum Dialog Justins* (Acta theologica danica 9; Copenhagen: Prostant Apud Munksgaard, 1966), 261–72.

⁴¹ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 100–5, 256–9, 361–2, 431–2.

⁴² William S. Kurz, "The Function of Christological Proof from Prophecy for Luke and Justin" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1976).

⁴³ Overbeck, "Ueber das Verhältniss Justins," 316–42. In his expanded version of W. M. L. de Wette's commentary, *Kurze Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1870), Overbeck reiterates this view: "Nicht kann vielmehr evident sein, als dass die A.G. das jüdische Christenthum als solches preisgibt und auf einem Standpunkt geschrieben ist, welchem das Heidenchristenthum als das in der Gemeinde durchaus vorherrschende Element gilt" (xxx). He also notes that Luke and Justin both neglect "paulinischen Antinomismus," and fail to articulate the same contrast between faith and works of the law that Paul espouses. Furthermore, against the conclusions of the Tübingen school, Overbeck argues that the presentation of Paul in Acts does not serve to reconcile Jewish and non-Jewish Christ-believers. Instead, he maintains that Acts

political concerns that parallel those of Justin.⁴⁴ Following Overbeck, O'Neill calls attention to a number of the same similarities between the theology and motives of Acts and those of Justin.⁴⁵ He argues that both authors attempt to gain recognition for Christ-believers within the Roman Empire by presenting them as the legitimate interpreters of the Jewish scriptures and their community as "the true organized representative of Jewish monotheism."⁴⁶ Nevertheless, because his primary aim in pointing out these similarities lies in positing a late date for the book of Acts, O'Neill does not develop his comparison of the writings of Luke and Justin to the same extent that Overbeck does.⁴⁷

Like Overbeck and O'Neill, Hyldahl maintains that Luke and Justin share common apologetic aims. He argues that both authors attempt to defend Christ-believers against false accusations of crimes against the state,⁴⁸ in part, by arguing that Christ-believers possess the proper understanding of the Jewish scriptures.⁴⁹ For Hyldahl, this argument lies at the heart of the apologetic purposes of both authors; by describing their close connection to the Jewish scriptures, Luke and Justin assert the legitimacy and ancient origins of the Christ-believing community and in this way plead for its acceptance within the Roman Empire.⁵⁰ Since the goal of Hyldahl's study lies in providing a detailed discussion of *Dialogue* 1–8, however, he limits his comparison of Luke and Justin to only a brief exploration of the similarities between their political defenses of Christ-believers.

attributes the rise of non-Jewish Christianity to the unbelief of Jews and concludes that this sentiment exemplifies the dominant view of non-Jewish Christ-believers.

⁴⁴ Overbeck, "Ueber das Verhältniss Justins," 340–1.

⁴⁵ O'Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 10–2, 168–75.

⁴⁶ O'Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 171.

⁴⁷ Although O'Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 10–28, asserts that Justin did not rely upon Luke-Acts, he points out correspondences between the writings of Luke and Justin in order to argue that they wrote in the same generation. Within this argument, O'Neill claims that Luke wrote during the same time period as Justin (~115–170 CE) but, contrary to the conclusions of earlier scholars (e.g., Albrecht Ritschl, Franz Overbeck, Ernst Haenchen), he maintains that Justin did not know or use Acts.

⁴⁸ Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christentum*, 264–5.

⁴⁹ Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christentum*, 268: "Der Schriftist der richtige Messias-Begriff zu entnehmen, indem das Leiden als konstitutives Element mit zu diesem Begriff nachgewiesen wird; es wird dann die übereinstimmung des schriftmässigen Messias-Begriffes mit dem historischen Jesus nachgewiesen, so dass Jesus eben kraft seines Leidens sich als Messias und das christliche Schriftverständnis sich als wahr erweist."

⁵⁰ Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christentum*, 266–9.

In his doctoral dissertation, Kurz examines the “form and function of Christological proof from prophecy” in the writings of Luke and Justin.⁵¹ Throughout this study, he discusses numerous points of agreement and disagreement between the two authors, some of which relate closely to my findings. Nevertheless, his comparison of the Christology of Luke and Justin, and his focus upon a “rhetorical-formal” and “lexicographical-grammatical” analysis of their writings, allow for only limited discussion of their respective representations of the exegesis of the Christ-believing community.⁵² Moreover, rather than developing a comprehensive comparison of the writings of Luke and Justin, Kurz provides a detailed analysis of Luke-Acts, and explains that he uses Justin’s *Dialogue* primarily as a “foil” for illuminating “the form and function of the Christological argument within Luke-Acts.”⁵³

More recently, Skarsaune has provided insightful commentary on the similarities and differences between Luke-Acts and the writings of Justin, including helpful summaries that outline their use of specific passages from the Jewish scriptures.⁵⁴ Of particular significance to my study is Skarsaune’s discussion of the close parallels between their conceptions of Christ’s post-resurrection instruction of the apostles. Although Skarsaune attributes these similarities to Justin’s reliance upon Luke-Acts or, more probably, an intermediary Lukan tradition,⁵⁵ he recognizes that they develop such traditions in distinct ways, as “independent theologians who had ideas of their own.”⁵⁶ Since Skarsaune provides a detailed investigation of Justin’s use of a wide variety of other Jewish and Christian sources, however, his comparison of the thought of Luke and Justin remains relatively brief.⁵⁷

⁵¹ Kurz, “Christological Proof,” 155–244, 250–5.

⁵² In the first half of his study, Kurz, “Christological Proof,” 16–149, focuses specifically upon Acts 2, 3, and 13 (Chapters One and Three) and the use of the term “Christ” in Luke-Acts (Chapter Two). In the remainder of his study, he compares the scriptural interpretation of Luke and Justin (155–244) and observes some of the similarities and differences between their use of the Jewish scriptures. On the whole, however, his focus upon their use of Christological proof from prophecy leads Kurz to develop his comparison and contrast of Luke and Justin in a different direction than my study.

⁵³ Kurz, “Christological Proof,” 15.

⁵⁴ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 100–5, 256–9, 361–2, 431–2.

⁵⁵ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 256–9, 361–2.

⁵⁶ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 431–2.

⁵⁷ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 288–9, 326–33.

The Use of Scripture in the Writings of Luke and Justin

Most of the studies that examine the scriptural interpretation of Luke or Justin focus upon only one of these two authors. Treatments of the use of scripture in the writings of Justin Martyr can be grouped into three basic categories: citations of the LXX and use of early Christian collections of proof-texts (i.e., 'testimonia');⁵⁸ exegetical methods, Christological interpretation, and use of the Mosaic law;⁵⁹ and reliance upon Greco-Roman and Jewish interpretive methods.⁶⁰ Likewise, studies of the use of the Jewish scriptures in Luke-Acts tend to fall into similar basic groupings: use of Christian collections of scriptural readings or of scripture in the infancy narrative;⁶¹ dependence upon the LXX and

⁵⁸ See, e.g., A. Hilgenfeld, "Die alttestamentlichen Citate Justins in ihrer Bedeutung für die Untersuchung über seine Evangelien," *Theologische Jahrbücher* 9 (1850): 385–439; J. Smit Sibinga, *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr I: The Pentateuch* (Leiden: Brill, 1963); P. Katz, "Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll," in *StPatr* 1 (1957): 343–53; Prigent, *L'Ancien Testament*; T. Christensen, "Justin og Testimonia Traditionen," *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 84 (1983): 39–62; J. L. Marshall, "Some Observations on Justin Martyr's Use of Testimonies," *StPatr* 16 (1985): 197–200; Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*; Martin C. Albl, "And the Scripture Cannot Be Broken": *The Form and Function of Early Christian Testimonia Collections* (NovTSup 96; Leiden: Brill, 1999).

⁵⁹ See, e.g., K. L. Grübe, "Die hermeneutischen Grundsätzen Justins des Märtyrers," *Der Katholik* 60 (1880): 139–59; L. Goppelt, *Typos: Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen* (BFCT 43; Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1939); Cecil L. Franklin, *Justin's Concept of Deliberate Concealment in the Old Testament* (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1961); Shotwell, *Biblical Exegesis*; David Aune, "Justin Martyr's Use of the Old Testament," *BETS* 9 (1966): 179–97; William H. C. Frend, "The O. T. in the Age of the Greek Apologists A. D. 130–180" *SJT* 26 (1973): 129–50; Kurz, "Christological Proof"; Robert Joly, *Christianisme et philosophie: Étudessur Justin et les apologistes-grecs du deuxième siècle* (Belgique: L' Université de Bruxelles, 1973), 94–124; Theodore Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law* (SBLDS 20; SBL and Scholars Press, 1975).

⁶⁰ See, e.g., P. Heinisch, *Der Einfluss Philos auf die älteste christliche Exegese: Barnabas, Justin und Clemens von Alexandria* (Münster i. W., Aschendorffschen Buchdruckerei, 1908); Leslie W. Barnard, "The Old Testament and Judaism in the Writings of Justin Martyr," *VT* 14 (1964): 394–406; Francis Osborn, *Justin Martyr* (BHT 47; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1973), 87–119; F. Manns, "L'Exegese de Justin dans le *Dialogue avec Tryphon*," *Analecta* 12 (1977): 130–52; M. Hirshman, "Polemical Literary Units in the Classical Midrashim and Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*," *JQR* 83 (1993): 369–84; idem, *Rivalry*, 31–66; Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 49–75.

⁶¹ See, e.g., L. Cerfaux, "Citations scripturaires et traditions textuelles dans le livre des Actes," in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel* (ed. P. Menoud and O. Cullmann; Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950); Ernst Haenchen, "Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte," *ZST* 51 (1954): 153–67; René Laurentin, *Structure et théologie de Luc I–II* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1957); Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (SNT 1;

Semitic influences;⁶² and application of particular exegetical methods or narrative strategies that influence the approach to the Jewish scriptures in Luke-Acts.⁶³

Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1969); John Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1976); M. D. Goulder, *The Evangelists' Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture* (London: SPCK, 1978).

⁶² For studies of the use of the LXX in Luke-Acts, see, e.g., William Kemp Lowther Clarke, "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts," in *Beginnings*, 2:66–105; J. Dupont, *Étude sur les Actes des Apôtres* (LD 45; Paris: Cerf, 1967); Traugott Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas* (TU 104; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1968); Gert J. Steyn, *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Act Apostolorum* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995). Regarding Aramaic sources and Semitic influences, see, e.g., C. C. Torrey, *The Composition and Date of Acts* (Cambridge, Mass.: HUP, 1916); M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1946); Max E. Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 21–55; J. A. Emerton, "A Review of *The Semitisms of Acts*," *JSS* 13 (1968): 284–90; H. F. D. Sparks, "The Semitisms in St. Luke's Gospel," *JTS* 1 (1950): 16–28.

⁶³ These types of studies of the use of scripture in Luke-Acts are quite diverse, but often use phrases such as "Christological," "proof from prophecy," "promise-fulfillment," or "apologetic function" to describe Luke's treatment of scripture, as the following representative list demonstrates: P. Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag am 20. August 1954* (BZNW, 21; ed. W. Eltester; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954), 165–86 (proof from prophecy and Christological use of scripture); E. Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1975) (proof from prophecy; Christological use of scripture; scriptures used to interpret activities of Jesus); Jacques Dupont, *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (trans. John R. Keating; New York: Paulist, 1979), 129–59 (Christological and apologetic use of the scriptures); Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive* (Christological and typological use of the scriptures; challenges Schubert's "proof from prophecy" model and suggests that scriptures interpret and explain events in Luke-Acts); Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (JSNTSup 12; JSOT Press, 1987) (Christological and typological use of scripture; Christ fulfills divine patterns from Jewish scriptures); Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (JSNTSup 110; Sheffield: SAP, 1995) (Christological and apologetic use of scripture and "proclamation from prophecy and pattern" motif [following Bock]); Nils Dahl, *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976), 87–98 (Luke-Acts provides a continuation of the biblical past); Robert Brawley, *Text to Text Pours forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Bloomington, Indiana: University Press, 1995) (Luke's intertextual approach to the scriptures with an emphasis on their theocentric focus); Thomas L. Brodie, "Luke-Acts as an Imitation and Emulation of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative," in *New Views on Luke and Acts* (ed. Earl Richard; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990); idem, *The Crucial Bridge: Elijah-Elisha Narrative as an Interpretive Synthesis of Genesis-Kings and a Literary Model for the Gospels* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000) (Luke's *mimesis* of the Elijah-Elisha narrative in his depiction of the mission of Jesus). For further summary of studies that discuss the use of scripture in Luke-Acts, see Bock, *Proclamation*, 19–23; François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty Years of Research (1950–2005)* (2nd ed.; Waco:

Although numerous studies evaluate the scriptural interpretation of Luke and Justin, scholars rarely explore how their descriptions of the Jewish scriptures and the exegesis of Christ-believers contribute to their articulation of the identity of the Christ-believing community. For example, scholars of Justin Martyr frequently note his elaborate depiction of Christ-believers as the true people of God, but seldom consider the role that his emphasis upon the Jewish scriptures plays in this description.⁶⁴ Similarly, studies of Luke-Acts often recognize that Luke attempts to define the Christ-believing community, but rarely point out the connection between his portrayal of the Christ-believing group and his treatment of the Jewish scriptures.⁶⁵ In recent years, however, scholars of Luke-Acts have attempted to address this neglect by evaluating the “ecclesiological function” of scriptural themes within

Baylor University Press, 2006), 106–17; Kenneth Duncan Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (JSNTSup 282; London: T&T Clark International, 2005), 1–30.

⁶⁴ An exception is the recent study of Rudolph, *Denn wir sind jenes Volk*, 266–73. Rudolph argues that Justin appeals to the Jewish scriptures in an attempt to demonstrate that scriptural prophecy had long predicted the coming of Christ and the proper form of worship, which the Christ-believing community originated. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 327–52, provides a helpful treatment of Justin's depiction of the “new people of God” but does not make this topic the primary emphasis of his inquiry. Judith M. Lieu, *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World* (New York: OUP, 2004), 82–3, Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 57–67, 288–91, and Denise Kimber Buell, *Why This New Race: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 94–115, provide insightful discussions regarding the relationship between Justin's use of scripture and his description of Christ-believers, but do not provide detailed analyses of his thought. Other shorter studies have addressed the use of the Jewish scriptures by Justin to bolster the identity of Christ-believers over against Jews and to validate the continuity between the practices of Christ-believers and the prophecies from the Jewish scriptures, but they tend to deal with one or two limited aspects of this theme. See, e.g., Ben Zion Bokser, “Justin Martyr and the Jews,” *JQR* 64 (1973): 97–122, who compares Christian and Jewish interpretations of the Mosaic law and its significance, and D. Jeffrey Bingham, “Justin and Isaiah 53,” *VC* 54 (2000): 248–61, who argues that Isaiah 53 played a significant role in validating the practices of Justin's community.

⁶⁵ Two exceptions are I. Howard Marshall and Hans Conzelmann. I. Howard Marshall, “Luke and his ‘Gospel,’” in *Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982 / hrsg. von Peter Stuhlmacher* (WUNT 28; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 289–308, argues that Luke aims to show the correspondence between prophecy and fulfillment in order to show how the “church has come together as a company of believing Jews and Gentiles and how it is related to the Jewish roots from which it sprung” (302). Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke* (trans. Geoffrey Buswell; Harper & Brothers: New York, 1960), 157, 162–63, also maintains that Luke uses the Jewish scriptures to describe the true people of God. He suggests that Luke draws upon the scriptures to show how salvation has been transferred from Jews to non-Jews. For further discussion of the position of Conzelmann, see Chapter Five.

the writings of Luke. For example, Rebecca Denova maintains that Luke derives the “structural pattern” of his story from the Jewish scriptures and argues that he uses this interpretive approach “to bind the [Christ-believing] community to Israel.”⁶⁶ From a slightly different perspective, David Pao discusses the use of an “Isaianic New Exodus program” to provide “the structural framework for the narrative of Acts.” He argues that Luke appeals to this “foundational story” from the Jewish scriptures to “construct” the identity of the Christ-believing community.⁶⁷ Similarly, Kenneth Litwak suggests that Luke uses a particular intertextual method of scriptural interpretation—“framing in discourse”—to show the legitimacy of Christ-believers over against other early Jewish groups.⁶⁸ Notably, each of these recent studies evaluates the “ecclesiological” use of scripture in Luke-Acts by attempting to identify the influence of the Jewish scriptures upon the framework of Luke’s narrative.⁶⁹

2. AIMS, RATIONALE AND PLAN OF STUDY

With the aim of making a fresh contribution to the study of Luke-Acts and the writings of Justin Martyr, I will evaluate their use of the Jewish scriptures to articulate the identity of the Christ-believing community by comparing and contrasting their respective depictions of the relationship between Christ-believers and the Jewish scriptures. Rather than focusing primarily upon how the Jewish scriptures function as a framework for the writings of these authors, this avenue of inquiry considers the way that Luke and Justin each present Christ-believers as authoritative interpreters of the Jewish scriptures and as recipients of the promises within these sacred texts.⁷⁰ In what follows, I will provide my rationale

⁶⁶ Rebecca I. Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup; Sheffield: SAP, 1997), 210.

⁶⁷ David Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (WUNT 130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 250.

⁶⁸ Litwak, *Echoes*, 32.

⁶⁹ Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 7–8, especially stresses that past studies have emphasized the Christological function of scriptural interpretation to the neglect of its ecclesiological function. By contrast, Bock, *Proclamation*, 274–8, sees a close relationship between Christological and ecclesiological interpretation of scripture in Luke-Acts, and argues that Luke’s Christological scriptural interpretation validates the composition of the Christ-believing community.

⁷⁰ Notably, this differs from the way that Denova, Pao, and Litwak have evaluated scriptural themes to guide the structure of Luke-Acts. Where relevant, my study will

and aims for comparing Luke and Justin in this way and, in conclusion, outline the overall plan of my study.

Why Compare Luke and Justin?

Of course, the repeated descriptions of how Jesus fulfilled the Jewish scriptures in the writings of Luke and Justin do not, in and of themselves, represent a remarkable parallel between them since this theme runs throughout early Christian literature. For example, Matthew frequently cites the Jewish scriptures (55 scriptural quotations in Matthew, as compared with a combined total of 65 quotations in the other three gospels), presents Torah interpretation as a central part of the message of Jesus (e.g., Matt 5:17–48), and emphasizes how Jesus fulfilled the scriptures through his repeated use of the formulaic introduction: “All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet who said” (Matt 1:22; 2:5, 15, 17, 23; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:35; 21:4; 26:54, 56; 27:9). Similarly, the author of the Fourth Gospel refers to Jesus’ fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures (John 2:13–24; 12:16; 20:9) and emphasizes the importance of interpreting and obeying them faithfully (John 5:39–46; 7:19, 49). Likewise, Paul frequently refers to how Jesus fulfilled the Jewish scriptures and stresses their relevance to the Christ-believing community (e.g., 1 Cor 10:11; Rom 3:21–22; 15:4; cf. 2 Tim 3:15–16). He also presents this fulfillment as a central part of the message of the gospel (e.g., 1 Cor 15:3–4; Rom 1:1–12; 16:25–26) and depicts the proper understanding of the scriptures as a special revelatory gift of Christ-believers (1 Cor 2:6–16; 2 Cor 3:12–18). Furthermore, a number of these themes find ongoing expression in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers (e.g., *1 Clem.* 36.1–2; 45.2; 53.1; *Barn.* 1.5–8; 6.8–15; 9.3–9; *Diogn.* 11.5; 12.1–3) and second-century Christian apologists.⁷¹ Luke and Justin thus represent but two among many early Christ-believing authors who attempt to demonstrate the connection

include a consideration of the way that Luke uses the Jewish scriptures to frame his narrative. Nevertheless, it will focus more closely upon the way that Luke depicts the activity of scriptural interpretation and identifies Christ-believers as the recipients of scriptural promises. This approach corresponds more closely to the recent work of scholars of early Judaism who attempt to evaluate the way that early Jewish interpreters present their exegesis as authoritative and use such a claim to define the privileged knowledge and status of their communities. For further discussion, see Chapter One below.

⁷¹ For a brief survey of this theme in the writings of the Christian apologists of the second-century, see Chapter Three below.

between the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures and the birth of the Christ-believing community.

Despite the ubiquity of this theme in first- and early second-century Christian literature, the parallels between the representations of scriptural interpretation in the writings of Luke and Justin stand apart from these other works in at least two significant ways.⁷² First, only Luke and Justin explicitly indicate that the risen Christ commissioned the first disciples to proclaim how he had fulfilled the Jewish scriptures, and depict their subsequent preaching activities as the extension of this message and the further realization of scriptural promises.⁷³ Second, as John O'Neill has observed, both authors attempt to explain the world-wide significance of this exegetical proclamation and to present it as a continuation of the work of Jesus.⁷⁴ Whereas a number of early Christian authors emphasize that Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures, and even present this fulfillment as a central part of the message of Christ-believers, Luke and Justin are the first authors to link the scriptural interpretation of Jesus and the apostles with a world-wide mission to non-Jews. This overarching theme in the writings of both authors leads them to include extensive explanations of how and why the Christ-believing community—comprised of Jews and non-Jews—could lay claim to the sacred texts of Jews. The writings of Luke and Justin thus serve as particularly important sources for understanding how non-Jewish Christ-believers came to appropriate the Jewish scriptures as their own.

“Judaism” and “Christianity”

Although Luke and Justin describe the origins of the exegetical tradition of the Christ-believing community in notably similar ways, it is no

⁷² Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, identifies the similarities between Luke and Justin as more prominent than those between Justin and other NT writings; cf. Rudolph, *Denn wir sind jenes Volk*, 50–8. Similarly, Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christendom*, 260–1, has argued that the theology of Luke provides a closer point of comparison with Justin than does the thought of the apostolic fathers.

⁷³ Although the other synoptic gospels affirm that Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures, as Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (Missoula: Scholars, 1977), 15, observes, Luke expands and refines this understanding so that it includes events in the life of the Christ-believing community, applies to the whole of his narrative (Luke 1:1 διήγησιν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων), and expresses the necessity (δεῖ) of the fulfillment of scripture.

⁷⁴ O'Neill, *Theology of Acts*: “The first writer, apart from Luke, to assume that the world mission of the Apostles should be told in the same breath as the history of Jesus’ death, resurrection, and ascension is Justin Martyr” (10).

longer tenable to conclude that they were part of a monolithic “Gentile Christianity” that stood over against Torah-observant “Judaism.” As scholars have recently pointed out, textual and material evidence suggests that many divergent forms of “Jewish Christianity” and “Gentile Christianity” developed throughout the first and second centuries.⁷⁵ These observations suggest that an early and clearly defined separation between “Jewish” and “Gentile” Christians can no longer be assumed.⁷⁶ Accordingly, I will attempt to provide a close evaluation of both the similarities and differences between the writings of Luke and Justin in order to bring the thought of each into sharper focus and to shed fresh light on the way that each describes the relationship between Christ-believers and the Jewish scriptures. Such an approach will help to clarify both what is similar and what is distinctive about each, and will serve as a corrective to the assumption that Luke and Justin wrote from an identical “Gentile Christian” perspective.

Since the Christ-believing group first emerged as a type of Judaism that only gradually became distinguished as a non-Jewish entity,⁷⁷ the scriptural interpretation of this community undoubtedly began to develop within the context of the exegetical practices of other early Jewish groups. In recognition of the close interaction and overlap among the beliefs and practices of various forms of “Judaism” and “Christianity” in this early period, I will evaluate the way that Luke and Justin each portray scriptural interpretation, in part, by considering how their exegetical strategies correspond to those of early Jewish exegetes.⁷⁸ Moreover, because of the uncertainties surrounding the

⁷⁵ Raymond E. Brown, “Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity but Two Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity,” *CBQ* 45 (1983): 74–9; cf. Annette Yoshiko Reed and Adam H. Becker, “Introduction,” in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (TSAJ 95; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 5.

⁷⁶ Brown, “Types,” 74.

⁷⁷ Reed and Becker, “Introduction,” 15. See also the descriptions of multiple “Judaisms” by Jacob Neusner, *Studying Classical Judaism: A Primer* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), 33, and Robert A. Kraft, “The Multifarious Jewish Heritage of Early Christianity,” in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* (ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 174–99.

⁷⁸ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 245–424, frequently notes correspondences between the writings of Justin and early Jewish sources, as well as Jewish-Christian sources, but rarely integrates these discussions with his comparison of Luke and Justin (see also 315–22, 326–27). Similarly, Kurz, “Christological Proof,” 178–84, 231–44, provides only limited discussion of the similarities and differences between the way that Luke and Justin express ideas that are both continuous and discontinuous with Judaism.

precise genealogical relationship between the writings of Luke and Justin, it is not my goal to draw firm conclusions regarding the possible dependence of Justin upon Luke and Acts. Although at times I will note their use of near parallel Jesus traditions, I will primarily seek to evaluate their respective representations of scriptural interpretation as if they were “independent theologians”; both authors appear to have been influenced by similar streams of tradition and Jewish exegetical claims, but each seeks to draw lines of continuity between the Christ-believing movement and the scriptures of Jews in his own way.

Luke and the Second Century?

My study does not attempt to provide direct and conclusive evidence for determining the date of Luke-Acts; findings that surface from this investigation could be used to argue for either a late or early date for this text. In certain cases, the notable similarities between the thought of Luke and Justin may support the theory that these two authors wrote during the same second-century era. Nevertheless, as we shall see, some of the most important differences between their representations of scriptural interpretation suggest that they did not address identical contextual concerns, and these differences call for a reconsideration of two assumptions that are often made by scholars who favor a second-century date for Luke-Acts: 1) that Luke participated in a form of second-century, non-Jewish “Christianity” that saw itself in contradistinction to “Judaism”⁷⁹ and 2) that Luke appeals to the Jewish scriptures in order to show the legitimacy of the Christ-believing community within the Roman Empire.⁸⁰ Thus, although the conclusions of my study do not depend on ascertaining a particular date for Luke-Acts, and establishing the date of this text has not been my aim, the evidence that emerges from my comparison of Luke and Justin has important implications for some of the arguments that scholars use to assert that Luke-Acts was written in the second century.

⁷⁹ See, e.g., O’Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 90; Tyson, *Marcion*, 59–60, 125–31; Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 325–9.

⁸⁰ See, e.g., O’Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 171; Nasrallah, “Acts,” 565–6; Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 256, 328–9.

Plan of Study

Within a world of intense competition for cultural recognition and priority, early Jewish authors often asserted that they possessed a privileged relationship to the Jewish scriptures. Although the Jesus movement originated as a Jewish group that also laid claim to the Jewish scriptures as a means of articulating its identity, over time, this group came to be comprised primarily of non-Jews. How was it possible for a non-Jewish group to continue to appropriate the scriptures of Jews and use these sacred texts to define themselves? To probe for answers to this question, my study will compare and contrast the way that Luke and Justin describe the relationship between the Christ-believing community and the Jewish scriptures by examining their portrayal of Christ-believers as authoritative interpreters of the Jewish scriptures (Part One) and their depiction of Christ-believers as heirs to the promises of scripture (Part Two).

In Part One, I will examine how early Jewish interpreters, Luke, and Justin similarly assert that they possess a divinely-inspired knowledge of the Jewish scriptures and use such a claim to define, or defend, the status of their communities in relation to outsiders. This includes a discussion of the way that scriptural exegesis came to be regarded as a mode of revelation in the Second Temple period and a means of defining group identity among early Jewish groups (Chapter One); a consideration of how Luke and Justin likewise depict the exegesis of Christ-believers as a revelatory activity that defines their special status (Chapter Two); and an evaluation of the extent to which this type of claim also corresponds to the attempts of early Jewish and Christian apologists to use the Jewish scriptures to defend themselves over against competing non-Jewish traditions (Chapter Three).

Subsequently, in Part Two, I will compare how Luke and Justin each identify Christ-believers as recipients of the promises of scripture. This section of my study discusses their common portrayal of the exegesis of Christ-believers as the realization of prophetic predictions of illumination and salvation at the end of the age (Chapter Four) and evaluates their respective presentations of Christ-believers as the recipients of scriptural promises that were originally made to Jews (Chapter Five). Finally, after summarizing my findings, I will conclude with a consideration of their broader implications for understanding how early Christ-believers represent the relationship between the Jewish scriptures and the Christ-believing community.

PART ONE

AUTHORITATIVE SCRIPTURAL INTERPRETATION
AND GROUP IDENTITY

CHAPTER ONE

EARLY JEWISH EXEGETES AND COMMUNITY IDENTITY*

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Throughout the Second Temple period, the Jewish scriptures functioned as a powerful cultural symbol that fostered a sense of national identity for the Jewish people. The centrality of sacred text to community life contributed to the emergence of interpreters who specialized in the study and interpretation of the scriptures. Yet the diversity of this era also gave rise to the development of competing views of what constituted their true meaning.¹ Various Jewish groups offered differing “hermeneutical ideologies,” or ways of reading the texts, which set them apart from other Jews as those who had special access to the proper knowledge of the will of God.² Claims to possess an authoritative ability to interpret the Jewish scriptures thus served as a means of articulating group identity for certain early Jewish communities.

In this chapter, I will examine the way that scriptural interpretation functioned as a mode of revelation in the Second Temple period and explore how different Jewish groups defined themselves with reference to this activity. To this end, I will survey select early Jewish texts that exemplify this approach to reading the Jewish scriptures. After providing a brief overview of recent secondary literature, I will discuss primary texts that show evidence of the shift from classical prophecy to “charismatic” or “revelatory” exegesis during the Second Temple

* Citations of the Hebrew Bible are taken from *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1983); Hebrew citations of Qumran texts follow Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), unless otherwise indicated. Greek citations of the LXX follow Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhard, eds. *Septuaginta: Editio altera* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006). English translations are my own, produced in consultation with the translations listed in the primary sources section of the bibliography.

¹ Carol A. Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 75.

² David E. Aune, “Charismatic Exegesis in Early Judaism and Early Christianity,” in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup 14; ed. J. H. Charlesworth and C. A. Evans; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 149.

period.³ Subsequently, I will provide a more extended discussion of early Jewish texts that demonstrate how descriptions of an inspired knowledge of the Jewish scriptures could serve as a means of articulating the identity and boundaries of certain early Jewish communities.

1.2 RECENT STUDIES OF EARLY JEWISH SCRIPTURAL INTERPRETATION

Scholars of early Judaism have long noted the transition from classical prophecy as the primary mode of receiving revelation from God in ancient Israel to the divinely inspired reading and interpretation of the Jewish scriptures in the Second Temple period.⁴ This type of activity purports to extend the revelatory experience of prophecy to the exegesis of prophetic texts, as well as to the interpretation of other parts of the Jewish scriptures. Recently, scholars have explored this phenomenon further by evaluating the manner in which early Jewish interpreters attempt to present their own scriptural interpretation as authoritative and use this type of claim to define the privileged status of their communities. The following provides a brief overview of recent studies that use this approach for evaluating early Jewish scriptural interpretation.

In his monograph, *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism*, Alex Jassen argues that the self-understanding of the Qumran community⁵ was founded

³ Alex P. Jassen, *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism* (STDJ 68; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 197–211, refers to this phenomenon as “revelatory exegesis” while Aune, “Charismatic Exegesis,” 126–50, uses the phrase “charismatic exegesis.”

⁴ For a recent, nuanced description of this shift, see Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 197–211. For further discussion of this phenomenon within Second Temple Judaism, see, e.g., John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perception of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986), 179–213; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon: A Contribution to the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity 3; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1977), 128–32; William H. Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSup 197; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995); John J. Collins, “Jewish Apocalypticism against its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment,” *BASOR* 220 (1975): 27–36; Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 108–43, 458–99.

⁵ “Qumran community” refers to a sectarian group(s) that shared distinctive ideological, theological and halakhic ideas that were preserved in a portion of the texts that were discovered in caves on the western shore of the Dead Sea, hence the name Qumran, although not all, probably not even the majority, of the members of this group actually lived at this desert site.

upon the belief that it represented “the embodiment of biblical Israel,” and therefore possessed the true understanding of the writings of Moses and the prophets.⁶ Since the community lived in a time much later than Moses and the prophets, however, it was “forced to renew the world of the ancient prophets and revelation for its own time.”⁷ Jassen maintains that the Qumran community did this, in part, by “rewriting the ancient prophetic experience” and reconfiguring it in order to present the Qumran community as “the heir of the ancient prophetic tradition.”⁸ According to Jassen, scriptural interpretation formed an integral part of this process because the Qumran community portrayed their exegesis of ancient prophecy as the proper extension and completion of the earlier form of divine communication (e.g., 1QpHab 7:1–8).⁹ Jassen also notes that the Qumran community drew a further link between the ancient prophets and themselves by presenting the former as lawgivers and heirs of Moses, and their own legislative activities as the proper continuation of ancient prophetic revelation.¹⁰ By repeatedly demonstrating a direct line between the ancient prophets and themselves, the Qumran community attempted to confer upon their interpretation of the Law and Prophets an authority equivalent to the classical prophets.

In her chapter on early Jewish scriptural interpretation in the book *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*, Carol A. Newsom also discusses the attempts of various interpreters or groups to present their scriptural interpretation as authoritative. Newsom argues that, during the Second Temple period, knowledge of the scriptures was “represented as the special provenance of priests, Levitical interpreters, or others who possess special expertise.”¹¹ In this sense, the sacred texts of Israel were the “common

⁶ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 4.

⁷ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 5.

⁸ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 5–6.

⁹ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 346. Since they, along with other early Jewish groups, regarded the writings of the ancient prophets as “divine communiqués” and predictions of the future, the Qumran community took on the task of uncovering the true meaning of these ancient repositories of divine truth. For a full discussion of this characteristic of Peshier Habbakuk, see Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 343–53. Jassen also discusses these characteristics in other early Jewish texts (see, e.g., 213–20, 310–4, 335–7, 353–62).

¹⁰ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 331–42. See, in particular, his discussion of 1QS 5:8–12; 8:15–16.

¹¹ Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 21–34. Although I refer to the “Jewish scriptures,” it should be noted that Newsom differentiates between “torah” and “scripture”

possession” of all Israel, on the one hand, but the “special possession” of privileged interpreters, on the other.¹² According to Newsom, this contradiction led to the development of “rival claims to expertise” in scriptural interpretation, and different movements within Second-Temple Judaism used various forms of discourse about the scriptures as a means of self-definition:

As torah and written scripture to which it was closely connected become cultural objects of increasing importance, so the incentive increased for different segments of the community to find in talk about torah a means to define themselves and to compete for influence.¹³

Newsom argues that various groups attempted to gain cultural influence by rendering some aspect of the scriptural interpretation problematic.¹⁴ By creating the perception that the scriptures were in some way difficult to understand, different interpreters, and the groups they represented, could carve out a privileged status for themselves as those who possessed exclusive knowledge or practices that enabled them to disclose their true meaning.¹⁵ Thus, “talk about the torah” helped individuals and groups to present their exegesis as authoritative, and to assert their special status over against other Jews.¹⁶

Similarly, Hindy Najman discusses the different ways that the authors of the book of *Jubilees* and the Temple Scroll present their accounts as “part of the original and authoritative Sinaitic revelation,” and the proper accompaniment of Mosaic Law.¹⁷ Although these texts do not present themselves as interpretations of scripture, they implicitly suggest that the material revealed on Sinai amounts to far more

in her discussion. She recognizes that torah as written text becomes prominent in the Second Temple period, but argues that torah and scripture should not be regarded as identical: “Not all that was regarded as scripture was torah or formed the basis for specific norms of conduct, and not everything that was believed to be required by God had a textual basis in scripture” (24).

¹² Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 34.

¹³ Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 28.

¹⁴ Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 70–1.

¹⁵ Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 23–75 (especially 65–75).

¹⁶ Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 43–59, discusses Daniel and other texts that demonstrate the use of knowledge claims to show the authority of particular scriptural interpretations. For Newsom, the book of *Jubilees*, Daniel, and Sirach serve as examples of how Second Temple Jewish interpreters promoted “expertise in torah and even esoteric claims to knowledge about torah, scripture, and the will of God” as strategies for defining themselves and their communities.

¹⁷ Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 41–53, at 53.

than what the books of Moses contain. Accordingly, *Jubilees* and the Temple Scroll supply additional and more ancient knowledge that enables the proper understanding of the Sinaitic covenant and laws.¹⁸ Najman maintains that *Jubilees* underscores the legitimacy of its special knowledge of the Pentateuch by indicating that the revelation in this book was mediated by an angel, recorded on heavenly tablets, and written by Moses.¹⁹ Likewise, she notes that the Temple Scroll validates its revelation by representing the text in the first person voice of God.²⁰ According to Najman, these and other self-defining strategies in both *Jubilees* and the Temple Scroll have the effect of presenting the knowledge that they contain as essential information that provides the proper perspective with which to interpret the Mosaic Torah.²¹

Other studies frequently note how claims to possess the correct understanding of the Jewish scriptures contribute to the articulation of community identity. For example, a number of scholars have observed that some early Jewish texts portray the wisdom or biblical interpretation of a particular group as an eschatological gift that confirms the elect status of its members;²² they are the chosen

¹⁸ As Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 53–60, explains, “both *Jubilees* and the Temple Scroll establish their origin and foundation long before Sinai, in the time of the patriarchs,” and contain the idea of a “pre-patriarchal covenant” (60).

¹⁹ Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 60–5; cf. Aharon Shemesh and Cana Werman, “Halakah at Qumran: Genre and Authority,” *DSD* 10 (2003): 106–12.

²⁰ Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 63, 67–8.

²¹ Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 74–98, also explores how Philo attempts to defend Judaism within the Roman Empire by “identifying various Greek philosophical ideas in the Torah of Moses” (74). Najman argues that Philo portrays his own interpretation of the Torah of Moses as a copy and continuation of the inspired activity of Moses and in this way demonstrates both the value of the Torah of Moses and his privileged status as an interpreter of Torah.

²² See John J. Collins, “Prophecy and Fulfillment in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (JSJSup 54; ed. John J. Collins; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 311. Similarly, Steven D. Fraade, “Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran,” *JJS* 44 (1993): 51–63, argues that the scriptural interpretation of the Qumran community served to define its elect identity as those who possessed an end-time revelation of the scriptures (see, especially IQS 8:12–16). Aharon Shemesh and Cana Werman, “Hidden Things and their Revelation,” *RevQ* 18 (1998): 420–1, also argue that the community’s special understanding of the “hidden things” and their scriptural interpretation fulfill the end-time injunction to “prepare the way of the Lord” (Isa 40:3; IQS 8:11–16). George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity,” in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, and “Others” in Late Antiquity* (ed. Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs; Chico: Scholars, 1985), 76–9, also observes that wisdom described in the Enochic collection has an “eschatological dimension” insofar as “it is God’s gift in preparation for the end” (77); cf. idem,

community of the last days who understands what the rest of Israel does not. Many of the same scholars have also highlighted the way that descriptions of the inspired exegesis of select leaders could serve to define the collective identity of a community;²³ the group as a whole gains access to and benefits from the special revelation and skill of its leaders. Furthermore, these scholars have noted that descriptions of a privileged knowledge of the scriptures could function as the means of distinguishing particular interpreters or groups from other Jews,²⁴ and even support the view that their group alone represents “true Israel.”²⁵

“The Nature and Function of Revelation in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and Some Qumranic Documents,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 92–101; idem, “Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture,” in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual Situational Contexts* (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 333–54. See also George J. Brooke’s discussion of “pre-destined membership” in “Justifying Deviance: The Place of Scripture in Converting to a Qumran Self-Understanding,” in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library*, 81–3.

²³ Although James C. VanderKam, “To What End? Functions of Scriptural Interpretation in Qumran Texts,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 305, and others (e.g., Michael Fishbane, “Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* [CRINT 2,1; ed. Martin Jan Mulder; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988, 360–7]) suggest that the Qumran community claimed to receive inspired interpretation through the Teacher of Righteousness and subsequently through appointed leaders, Fraade, “Interpretive Authority,” 51–63, has rightly emphasized the way that the self-understanding of the Qumran community was linked with “the collective activity of scriptural interpretation” (51) and the possession of “an esoteric knowledge of God’s will” (53); cf. Shemesh and Werman, “Hidden Things,” 411–21. See also Maxine L. Grossman, “Cultivating Identity: Textual Virtuosity and ‘Insider’ Status,” in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS* (STDJ 70; ed. Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 1–11; Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 70–5; Nickelsburg, “Revealed Wisdom,” 74–5; Brooke, “Justifying Deviance,” 81.

²⁴ See, e.g., Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 55–75; idem, “Constructing ‘We, You, and the Others’ through Non-polemical Discourse,” in *Defining Identities*, 13–21; George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Polarized Self-Identification in the Qumran Texts,” in *Defining Identities*, 23–31; Grossman, “Cultivating Identity,” 1–3; Brooke, “Justifying Deviance,” 84–7; Fraade, “Interpretive Authority,” 51–2.

²⁵ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 4–6; Nickelsburg, “Revealed Wisdom,” 80; Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 68–9; George Brooke, “Prophecy and Prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Looking Backwards and Forwards,” in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (OTS 427; ed. Michael Floyd and Robert D. Haak; New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 163–4; Philip R. Davies, “‘Old’ and ‘New’ Israel in the Bible and the Qumran Scrolls: Identity and Difference,” in *Defining Identities*, 33–41; James C. VanderKam, “Sinai Revisited,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 44–60; John J. Collins, “The Construction of Israel in the Sectarian

Such observations suggest that scriptural interpretation played a significant role in the articulation of community identity in the Second Temple period.

1.3 EXEGESIS AS A MODE OF REVELATORY EXPERIENCE

1.3.1 1–2 Chronicles

The book of Chronicles, which itself represents an interpretive retelling of earlier biblical traditions, provides evidence of a shift from classical prophecy to inspired interpretation of written traditions.²⁶ This development in Chronicles occurs through the portrayal of certain individuals who receive divine inspiration even though they are not identified as prophets.²⁷ The text points up the divine origin of their messages by including introductory formulas that describe their spirit-inspired state: “the spirit came upon Amasai” (1 Chron 12:19); “the spirit of God came upon Azariah” (2 Chron 15:1–8); “the spirit of YHWH came upon Jahaziel” (2 Chron 20:14–17); and “the spirit of God took possession of Zechariah” (2 Chron 24:17–22).²⁸ As Sara Japhet notes, these descriptions of direct inspiration are especially significant since the Chronicler does not even use such elaborate introductions when recounting the speeches

Rule Books,” in *Judaism in Late Antiquity Part 5 Volume 1: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Theory of Israel* (Handbook of Oriental Studies: Section One: The Middle East 56; ed. Alan J. Avery-Peck, Jacob Neusner, and Bruce Chilton; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 25–42.

²⁶ For further discussion of this transition, see, e.g., Schneidewind, *Word of God*; Rex Mason, *Preaching the Tradition: Homily and Hermeneutics after the Exile based on the “Addresses” in Chronicles, the Speeches in Ezra and Nehemiah and the Post-Exilic Books* (Cambridge: CUP, 1990); David L. Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles* (SBL Monograph Series 23; Missoula: Scholars, 1977); Gerhard Von Rad, “The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles,” in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (London: SCM Press, 1966), 267–80.

²⁷ Schniedewind, *Word of God*, 127, concludes that the Chronicler presents prophets as “interpreters of events” but depicts another group of divinely inspired messengers who provide “inspired interpretation of authoritative texts.” See also Thomas Willi, *Die Chronikals Auslegung* (FRLANT 106; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 215–44; I. L. Seeligmann, “Die Auffassung von der Prophetie in der deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtsschreibung,” in *Congress Volume Göttingen 1977* (VTSup 29; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 254–84.

²⁸ Schniedewind, *Word of God*, 108–20; cf. Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 208. Schniedewind and Jassen both suggest that Neco’s report that he had received a command from God represents a fifth example (2 Chron 35:20–22).

of more familiar prophets like Nathan, Gad, and Jehu.²⁹ Moreover, in each of these cases, such figures do not mediate new prophetic revelation but instead rework and reapply earlier prophetic texts.

The speech of Azariah from 2 Chron 15:1–8 provides a particularly cogent example of how the Chronicler characterizes this new form of divine revelation.³⁰ In the passage, he places an anthology of citations of earlier prophetic texts on the lips of Azariah, but presents this material as a prophetic message:³¹

- (1) ועזריהו בן-עודד היתה עליו רוח אלהים
- (2) ויצא לפני אסא ואמר לו שמעוני אסא וכל־יהודה ובנימין יהוה עמכם בהיותכם עמו ואס־תדרשו ימצא לכם ואס־תעזבוהו יעזב אתכם וימים רבים לישראל ללא אלהי אמת וללא כהן מורה וללא תורה
- (4) וישב בצר־לו על־יהוה אלהי ישראל ויבקשו וימצא להם
- (5) ובעתים ההם אין שלום ליוצא ולבא כי מהומת רבות על כל־יושבי הארצות
- (6) וכתתו גוי־בגוי ועיר בעיר כ־אלהים הממם בכל־צרה
- (7) ואתם חזקו ואל־ירפו ידיכם כי יש שכר לפעלתכם
- (8) וכשמע אסא הדברים האלה והנבואה עַד הנביא התחזק ויעבר השקוצים מכל־ארץ יהודה ובנימין ומן־הערים אשר לכד מהר אפרים ויחדש את־מזבח יהוה אשר לפני אולם יהוה

- (1) The spirit of God came upon Azariah son of Oded.
- (2) He went out to meet Asa and said to him, “Listen to me, Asa, and all Judah and Benjamin: The LORD is with you when you are with him. And if you seek him, he will be found by you, but if you forsake him, he will forsake you.
- (3) For a long time Israel was without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without law;
- (4) but in their distress they turned to the LORD, the God of Israel, and sought him, and he was found by them.
- (5) In those times it was not safe for anyone to go or come, because great disturbances afflicted all the inhabitants of the lands.

²⁹ Sara Japhat, *I–II Chronicles: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 2:717. Compare, for example, 1 Chron 17:3; 21:9; 2 Chron 19:2.

³⁰ As Pancratius C. Beentjes, “Prophets in the Book of Chronicles,” in *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as a Historical Person, Literary Character and Anonymous Artist* (OTS 45; ed. Johannes C. de Moor; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 47, notes, the Chronicler used the narrative of 1 Kgs 15:9–24 but the majority of his narrative does not come from the earlier account. As such, the account of Azariah represents the work of the Chronicler.

³¹ For further discussion of possible allusions to earlier scriptural material in 2 Chron 15:1–7, see Japhat, *I–II Chronicles*, 2:716; Von Rad, “Levitical Sermon,” 271; Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*, 48–9; Michael A. Fishbane, “Inner-Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel,” in *The Garments of Torah: Essays in Biblical Hermeneutics* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 14–6; Schneidewind, *Word of God*, 114–5; Beentjes, “Prophets in Chronicles,” 51.

- (6) They were crushed, nation against nation and city against city, for God troubled them with every sort of distress.
- (7) But you, be strong, do not let your hands be weak, for there is reward for your work."
- (8) When Asa heard these words, the prophecy of the son of Oded, the prophet, he took courage, and removed the abominable idols from all the land of Judah and Benjamin and from the towns that he had captured in the hill country of Ephraim. He repaired the altar of the LORD that was in front of the portico of the LORD.
(2 Chron. 15:1–8)

Verses 2 and 7 echo Deut 31:7–8 ("he will be with you" and "be strong and bold") and Josh 1:7–8 ("be strong and very courageous").³² The Chronicler thus alludes to earlier exhortations to military service and applies them to a circumstance that requires cultic reform.³³ A number of commentators also note that the phrase "Israel was without the true God, without a teaching priest, and without law" (verse 3) alters and reappropriates a passage from Hos 3:4: "For the Israelites shall remain many days without king or prince, without sacrifice or pillar, without ephod or teraphim."³⁴ If so, the citation and adaptation underscores the necessity of cultic rather than military leadership. Furthermore, the parallel words and phrases in 2 Chron 15:4–7 and Zech 8:9–11 suggest that the Chronicler was strongly influenced by language and motifs from Zechariah.³⁵ The Chronicler thus portrays the speech of Azariah as a prophetic oracle, but the message itself contains a set of scriptural citations that apply to his contemporary context and concerns.³⁶

³² Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 388–9.

³³ Beentjes, "Prophets in Chronicles," 49–50, and others have suggested that 2 Chron 15:2 also alludes to the Deuteronomistic theology of Deut 4:29–30 and Jer 29:13–14; cf. Schniedewind, *Word of God*, 114; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 388–9.

³⁴ Schniedewind, *Word of God*, 114; Fishbane, "Inner-Biblical Exegesis," 15; idem, *Biblical Interpretation*, 388–92; Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*, 48–51; Japhat, *I–II Chronicles*, 2:719; I. L. Seeligmann, "The Beginnings of Midrash in Chronicles," *Tarbiz* 49 (1979–1980): 20–2. Whereas Hosea emphasizes the role of political leadership, the Chronicler highlights the necessity of the priest and teaching. Fishbane also suggests that the phrase *מהומת רבות* in 2 Chron 15:5b recalls Amos 3:9 and that 2 Chron 15:2–4 parallels Deut 4:29–30; cf. Schniedewind, *Word of God*, 114.

³⁵ So Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*, 48–9; Schniedewind, *Word of God*, 114–5; Beentjes, "Prophets in Chronicles," 51–2. See the common terms and phrases "there is no peace" (*שָׁלוֹם אֵין*), "distress" (*צָר, צָרָה*), and "for him who went out and came in" (*לְיוֹצֵא וּלְבָא*). Beentjes also notes the parallel phraseology between 2 Chron 15:7 *כִּי יֵשׁ שָׂכָר לַפְּעֻלָּתָם* and Jer 31:16 *כִּי יֵשׁ שָׂכָר לַפְּעֻלָּתְךָ*.

³⁶ Japhat, *I–II Chronicles*, 2:716; Fishbane, "Inner-Biblical Exegesis," 16; Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*, 50; Schniedewind, *Word of God*, 115.

The “resignification” of the phrase “word of YHWH” (דבר יהוה) in Chronicles represents another indicator of this implicit emphasis upon the interpretation of written revelation.³⁷ The phrase occurs 241 times in the Hebrew Bible and almost always refers to a prophetic oracle (221 times).³⁸ In 1–2 Chronicles, however, “word of YHWH” also depicts Mosaic legislation. Of the fifteen times that the phrase occurs in 1–2 Chronicles, three come from direct dependence upon 1–2 Kings, six refer to a prophetic word without dependence upon 1–2 Kings, and six refer to the Mosaic law.³⁹ A comparison of 2 Kgs 22:13 and 2 Chron 34:21 highlights this transition in the use of “word of YHWH”:

לכו דרשו את־יהוה בעדי ובעד־העם ובעד כל־יהודה על־דברי הספר
הנמצא הזה כִּי־גדולה חמת יהוה אשר־היא נצתה בנו על אשר לא־שמעו
אבותינו על־דברי הספר הזה לעשות ככל־הכתוב עלינו

Go, inquire of the LORD for me, for the people, and for all Judah, about the words of this book that has been found; for the wrath of the LORD that is kindled against us is great, because our ancestors have not obeyed *the words of this book, to do according to all that is written concerning us.* (2 Kgs 22:13)

לכו דרשו את־יהוה בעדי ובעד הנשאר בישראל וביהודה על־דברי הספר
אשר נמצא כִּי־גדולה חמת־יהוה אשר נתכה בנו על אשר לא־שמרו
אבותינו את־דבר יהוה לעשות ככל־הכתוב על־הספר הזה

Go, inquire of the LORD for me and for the remnant in Israel and in Judah, about the words of the book that has been found; for the wrath of the LORD that is poured out on us is great, because our ancestors have not kept the *word of the LORD, to do according to all that is written in this book.* (2 Chron 34:21)

By identifying the Torah scroll that Hilkiyah finds as the “word of YHWH,” the Chronicler implicitly equates this written text with the oracular revelation that prophets receive. According to Schniedwind,

³⁷ Schniedewind, *Word of God*, 130.

³⁸ O. Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament* (BZAW 64; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1934), 76; cf. Gerhard Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (2 vols.; trans. David Muir Gibson Stalker; New York: Harper & Row, 1962–1965), 2:87.

³⁹ 1 Chron 10:13 (Mosaic command); 11:3, 10 (prophetic word); 15:15 (Mosaic command); 22:8 (prophetic word); 2 Chron 11:2 (cf. 1 Kgs 12:22 דבר האלהים; prophetic word); 12:7 (prophetic word); 18:4, 18 (cf. 1 Kgs 22:5, 19; prophetic word); 19:11 (probably Mosaic command); 30:12 (Mosaic command); 34:21 (Mosaic command); 35:6 (Mosaic command); 36:21, 22 (prophetic word).

the use of the phrase to refer to both oracular prophecy and the written Torah represents a step in the process of change that ultimately leads to the primacy of Torah:⁴⁰ "Once the 'word of YHWH' becomes the *Torah*, then the prophet naturally becomes the bearer of the law."⁴¹ Although this conclusion might be overstated, the use of "word of YHWH" to refer to Mosaic legislation in Chronicles suggests at least a widening in the description of the prophetic revelatory experience to encompass the reading and re-application of earlier, written traditions.⁴²

1.3.2 *Ezra*

Like Chronicles, the book of Ezra provides evidence of a shift in understanding how divine revelation was mediated. The text clearly portrays Ezra as a "skilled scribe" who reads and interprets Torah for the people (Ezra 7:6).⁴³ Indeed, the role of Ezra as a scribal expert "characterizes his entire mission."⁴⁴ Ezra 7:6–10 also presents his skill in and communication of Torah as a divinely inspired activity. Reminiscent of the

⁴⁰ According to Schniedewind, *Word of God*, 137, the Deuteronomistic presentation of Moses as the paradigmatic prophet influenced this shift which eventually led to the replacement of prophecy with the transmission of correct Torah interpretation.

⁴¹ Schniedewind, *Word of God*, 138. See also Willi, *Die Chronikals Auslegung*, 215–44, who argues that the prophets in Chronicles function as exegetes who promote the concept of a historical written tradition; cf. Rosemarie Mischeel, *Die Seher- und Prophetenüberlieferungen in der Chronik* (BBET 18; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1983), 67.

⁴² This transition in revelatory experience may also be related to the link that the Chronicler draws between prophets and Levites. As Harry V. Van Rooy has noted in his essay, "Prophet and Society in the Persian Period According to Chronicles," in *Second Temple Studies 2: Temple Community in the Persian Period* (JSOTSup 175; ed. Tamara C. Eskenazi and Kent H. Richards; Sheffield: JSOT, 1994), 176–9, "the Chronicler identifies prophets of his day with the prophets of the nation's history" (177). In a number of ways, the Chronicler presents Levites as recipients and mediators of divine revelation and, in some cases, replaces prophets with Levites. Compare, for example, the reference to "priests and prophets" in 2 Kgs 23:22 with the reference to "priests and Levites" in 2 Chron 34:30. For further discussion of this transition and the role of "Levitical prophets" in Chronicles, see Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy*, 55–87; cf. Jacob Martin Myers, *Chronicles* (AB 12; Garden City: Doubleday, 1963), 2:208; Aubrey Rodway Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1962), 72–3.

⁴³ H. G. M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (WBC 16; Waco, Word Books, 1985), 92, suggests that the description of Ezra as a "skilled scribe" indicates his astuteness in study and exposition of the Law (cf. Ps 45:2); cf. Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988), 137.

⁴⁴ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 210. See, especially, the descriptions of Ezra in 7:10, 12, 14, 25–26.

revelatory experience of the classical prophets, this passage indicates that “the hand of YHWH” was upon Ezra:

- (6) הוא עזרא עלה מבבל והוא־ספר מהיר בתורת משה אשר־נתן יהוה אלהי ישראל ויתן־לו המלך כיד־יהוה אלהיו עליו כל בקשתו ויעלו מבני־ישראל ומן־הכהנים והלויים והמשררים והשערים והנתינים אל־ירושלם בשנת־שבע לארתחשסתא המלך
- (8) ויבא ירושלם בחדש החמישי היא שנת השביעית למלך
- (9) כי באחד לחדש הראשון הוא יסד המעלה מבבל ובאחד לחדש החמישי בא אל־ירושלם כיד־אלהיו הטובה עליו
- (10) כי עזרא הכין לבבו לדרוש את־תורת יהוה ולעשת וללמד בישראל חק ומשפט
- (6) This Ezra went up from Babylonia. He was a scribe skilled in the law of Moses that the LORD the God of Israel had given; and the king gave him all his request, for the hand of the LORD his God was upon him.
- (7) Some of the people of Israel, and some of the priests and Levites, the singers and gatekeepers, and the temple servants also went up to Jerusalem, in the seventh year of King Artaxerxes.
- (8) He came to Jerusalem in the fifth month, which was in the seventh year of the king.
- (9) For on the first day of the first month he began the departure up from Babylon, and on the first day of the fifth month he came to Jerusalem, for the good hand of his God was upon him.
- (10) For Ezra had set his heart to study the law of the LORD, and to do it, and to teach the statutes and ordinances in Israel.

(Ezra 7:6–10)

Although the expression “hand of YHWH... upon him” (Ezra 7:9, 28; cf. 7:9) typically denotes the force with which divine inspiration takes hold of a prophet,⁴⁵ in this instance, the phrase refers to the divine favor that Ezra received to carry out his mission as a student and interpreter of the Torah. As Jassen observes, “Ezra’s status as a ‘skilled scribe’ is grounded in his receipt of the divine hand.”⁴⁶ Furthermore, Ezra 7:10 uses the infinitive construct לדרוש, a verb more often used to describe inquiry

⁴⁵ See e.g., Ezek 1:3; 3:14, 22; 8:1; 33:22; 37:1; 40:1; 2 Kgs 3:15; Isa 8:11; Jer 15:17. Peter R. Ackroyd, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (ed. G. Johannes Botterweck; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973), 5:421; G. A. Cooke, *A Critical and Exegetical commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1936), 6, 42; Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 22; Garden City, Doubleday, 1983), 41; J. J. M. Roberts, “The Hand of Yahweh,” VT 21 (1971): 244–51. In a number of instances, the phrase “hand of YHWH” signals prophetic ecstasy and shows the urgency and power with which the prophet speaks.

⁴⁶ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 211; cf. Michael Fishbane, “From Scribalism to Rabbinism: Perspectives on the Emergence of Classical Judaism,” in *The Sage in Israel*

of God through the mediation of a prophet, to describe Ezra's study of the Mosaic law.⁴⁷ The textual study of Ezra thus becomes analogous to the inspiration that oracular prophets receive.⁴⁸ Such a description of the exegetical activities of Ezra demonstrates a shift in the understanding of how one receives divine revelation during the post-exilic period. Once guided by and founded upon direct revelation to the prophets, the people of Yehud became a community guided by the inspired study and reinterpretation of ancient written revelation.⁴⁹

1.3.3 *Ben Sira*

A similar understanding of inspired study and exegesis of the scriptures appears in the writings of Ben Sira. It is a commonplace for scholars to note that a primary theme of this text lies in its identification of wisdom with Mosaic Law.⁵⁰ In Sirach 24, Ben Sira praises wisdom as a universal entity (Sir 24:1–22) but subsequently depicts wisdom as Mosaic law:

and the Ancient Near East (ed. John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 440–1.

⁴⁷ Of the 16 times that *לדרוש* occurs in the Hebrew Bible, in 11 instances it refers to seeking for divine revelation from God or a deity through a prophet or a medium (Gen 25:22; Ex 18:15; 1 Kgs 14:5; 22:8; 2 Kgs 1:3, 6, 16 [2x]; 22:18; 1 Chron 21:30; Ezek 20:1). Other forms of *דרש* can also express inquiry of God or other deities through prophetic mediation (e.g., Deut 12:30; 18:11; 1 Sam 28:7; 1 Kgs 22:5, 7, 8; 2 Kgs 1:2; 3:11; 8:8; 22:13; 1 Chron 10:13, 14; 15:13; 21:30; 2 Chron 18:4, 6, 7; 34:21, 26; Isa 8:19; 19:3; Jer 21:2; 37:7; Ezek 14:3 (2x), 7, 10; 20:1, 3 (2x), 31 (2x); 36:27; Zeph 1:6) but rarely to textual inquiry (Isa 34:16; possibly Eccl 1:13; 1 Chron 28:8; Ps 119:45, 94, 155).

⁴⁸ Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 129.

⁴⁹ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 211. Fishbane, "From Scribalism to Rabbinism," 440–3, also suggests that the reference to the loss of the Urim and Thummim in Neh 7:65 and the subsequent account of the public reading and interpretation of Torah (Neh 8:1–8) marks a shift in "modes of access to divine revelation" (441). For further discussion of Nehemiah 8 and Ezra 7, including the role of Ezra as a "mantic hermeneut of the Torah of YHWH," see Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 107–13, 245, 539.

⁵⁰ See, e.g., R. Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, hebräisch und deutsch* (Berlin: Reimer, 1906), 1:xxiii; Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (trans. John Bowden; London: SCM, 1974), 139, 160; Alexander A. Di Lella and Patrick W. Skehan, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 75–6; Bruce M. Metzger and Roland E. Murphy, eds., *The New Annotated Apocrypha: The Apocryphal/ Deuterocanonical Books of the Old Testament* (New York: OUP, 1991), 86; George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 57; Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 130.

- (23) Ταῦτα πάντα βίβλος διαθήκης θεοῦ ὑψίστου νόμον ὃν ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν Μωσῆς κληρονομίαν συναγωγᾶς Ἰακωβ,
- (25) ὁ πιμπλὼν ὡς Φισων σοφίαν καὶ ὡς Τίγρις ἐν ἡμέραις νέων,
- (26) ὁ ἀναπληρὼν ὡς Εὐφράτης σύνεσιν καὶ ὡς Ἰορδάνης ἐν ἡμέραις θερισμοῦ,
- (27) ὁ ἐκφαίνων ὡς φῶς παιδεῖαν ὡς Γηων ἐν ἡμέραις τρυγῆτος.
- ...
- (30) Κἀγὼ ὡς διῶρυξ ἀπὸ ποταμοῦ καὶ ὡς ὑδραγωγὸς ἐξῆλθον εἰς παράδεισον
- (31) εἶπα Ποτιῶ μου τὸν κήπον καὶ μεθύσω μου τὴν πρασιάν· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγένετό μοι ἡ διῶρυξ εἰς ποταμόν, καὶ ὁ ποταμός μου ἐγένετο εἰς θάλασσαν.
- (32) ἔτι παιδεῖαν ὡς ὄρθρον φωτιῶ καὶ ἐκφανῶ αὐτὰ ἕως εἰς μακράν·
- (33) ἔτι διδασκαλίαν ὡς προφητείαν ἐκχεῶ καὶ καταλείψω αὐτὴν εἰς γενεὰς αἰώνων.
- (34) ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ ἐμοὶ μόνῳ ἐκοπίασα, ἀλλ’ ἅπασιν τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν αὐτήν.
- (23) All this (i.e., universal wisdom) is the book of the covenant of the Most High God, the law that Moses commanded us as an inheritance for the congregations of Jacob.
- (25) It overflows, like the Pishon, with wisdom, and like the Tigris in days of first fruits.
- (26) It runs over, like the Euphrates, with understanding, and like the Jordan in days of harvest.
- (27) It reveals instruction like light, like the Gihon in days of vintage.
- ...
- (30) And I, like a canal from a river, like a water channel, I go out into a garden,
- (31) I said, "I will water my garden and irrigate my flower-bed." And behold, my canal became a river, and my river became as a sea.
- (32) I will again shine forth instruction like the dawn, and I will reveal it from far away.
- (33) I will again pour out teaching like prophecy, and leave it to all future generations.
- (34) Observe that I have not toiled for myself alone but for all who seek it (i.e., wisdom) diligently.
- (Sir 24:23–34)

Since Ben Sira equates universal wisdom with the "covenant of the Most High" and the "law of Moses" in Sirach 24, his description of his own wisdom teaching should be understood as interpretation of the Mosaic law;⁵¹ just as the Mosaic law pours forth wisdom like a river, so his

⁵¹ Leo G. Perdue, "Ben Sira and the Prophets," in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit: Essays in Honor of Alexander A. Di Lella*, O.F.M. (CBQMS 38; ed. Jeremy

scriptural interpretation represents a canal from this torrent. By also likening his teaching to prophecy (Sir 24:33),⁵² Ben Sira characterizes his interpretation of the Mosaic law as a form of divine revelation that stands in continuity with the ancient prophetic tradition.⁵³

In his portrait of the ideal scribe (Sir 38:34b–39:11), Ben Sira more explicitly highlights the centrality of scriptural interpretation and depicts it as a divinely inspired activity. By preceding his discourse with a description of the responsibilities of artisans and laborers, he suggests that their work stands in contrast to that of the wise scribe:

- (39:1) Πλὴν τοῦ ἐπιδιδόντος τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ διανοομένου ἐν νόμῳ ὑψίστου, σοφίαν πάντων ἀρχαίων ἐκζητήσει καὶ ἐν προφητείαις ἀσχοληθήσεται,
- (39:2) διήγησιν ἀνδρῶν ὀνομαστῶν συντηρήσει καὶ ἐν στροφαῖς παραβολῶν συνεισελεύσεται,
- (39:3) ἀπόκρυφα παροιμιῶν ἐκζητήσει καὶ ἐν αἰνίγμασι παραβολῶν ἀναστραφήσεται.
- (39:4) ἀνὰ μέσον μεγιστάνων ὑπηρετήσεται καὶ ἔναντι ἡγουμένων ὀφθήσεται· ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίων ἔθνων διελεύσεται, ἀγαθὰ γὰρ καὶ κακὰ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐπείρασεν.
- (39:5) τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπιδώσει ὀρθρίσαι πρὸς κύριον τὸν ποιήσαντα αὐτὸν καὶ ἔναντι ὑψίστου δεηθήσεται· καὶ ἀνοίξει στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτοῦ δεηθήσεται.
- (39:6) ἐὰν κύριος ὁ μέγας θελήσῃ, πνεύματι συνέσεως ἐμπλησθήσεται· αὐτὸς ἀνομβρήσει ῥήματα σοφίας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν προσευχῇ ἐξομολογήσεται κυρίῳ·
- (39:7) αὐτὸς κατευθυνεῖ βουλὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπιστήμην καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀποκρύφοις αὐτοῦ διανοηθήσεται·

Corley and Vincent T. M. Skemp; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2005), 137; Pancratius C. Beentjes, "Prophets and Prophecy in the Book of Ben Sira," in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (OTS 427; ed. Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak; New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 148–9; Randal A. Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation, and Judgment* (SBLEJL 8; Atlanta: Scholars, 1995), 56–7; Di Lella and Skehan, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 337–8.

⁵² As Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 312, notes, the phrase "like prophecy" could indicate that the content of the instruction of the scribe was like prophecy or it could mean that the process of "pouring out" instruction was similar to prophecy. In either case, Ben Sira sees the teaching of the wise scribe as analogous to prophecy but the former meaning would more closely link scribal wisdom to divine revelation.

⁵³ Beentjes, "Prophets in Ben Sira," 148–9; Perdue, "Ben Sira," 137; John G. Gammie, "The Sage in Sirach," in *Sage in Israel*, 370–1; Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 129; Burton L. Mack, *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 225–6; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 134–5.

- (39:8) αὐτὸς ἐκφανεῖ παιδείαν διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν νόμῳ διαθήκης κυρίου κανχήσεται.
- (39:9) αἰνέσουσιν τὴν σύνεσιν αὐτοῦ πολλοί, καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἐξαλειφθήσεται· οὐκ ἀποστήσεται τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ζήσεται εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν·
- (39:10) τὴν σοφίαν αὐτοῦ διηγῶνται ἔθνη, καὶ τὸν ἔπαινον αὐτοῦ ἐξαγγελεῖ ἐκκλησία·
- (39:11) ἐὰν ἐμμείνη, ὄνομα καταλείψει ἢ χίλιοι, καὶ ἐὰν ἀναπαύσεται, ἐκποιεῖ αὐτῷ.
- (39:1) How different (from artisans and laborers) the one who devotes his life to studying the law of the Most High. He seeks out the wisdom of all the ancients, and is occupied with prophecies;
- (39:2) he preserves the accounts of the famous and penetrates the subtleties of parables;
- (39:3) he seeks out the hidden meanings of proverbs and is at home with the obscurities of parables.
- (39:4) He serves among the great and appears before rulers; he travels in the land of foreign nations and tests what is good and evil among humans.
- (39:5) He sets his heart to rise early to seek the Lord who made him, and he petitions before the Most High; he opens his mouth in prayer and asks pardon for his sins.
- (39:6) If the great Lord is willing, he will be filled with the spirit of understanding; he will pour forth his words of wisdom and give thanks to the Lord in prayer.
- (39:7) He (the Lord) will direct his counsel and knowledge, and he meditates on his mysteries.
- (39:8) He will reveal the wisdom of his instruction, and will glory in the law of the Lord's covenant.
- (39:9) Many will praise his understanding and it shall never be removed. His memory will not leave, and his name will live to generation after generation.
- (39:10) Nations shall declare his wisdom and the assembly shall proclaim his praise.
- (39:11) If he remains, he will leave a name greater than a thousand, and if he dies, it is good enough for him.
- (Sir 39:1–11)

The poem can be summarized in the following way: the first strophe depicts the scribe's study of the sacred scriptures and other ancient traditions (Sir 38:34c–39:3); the second strophe describes his other activities (Sir 39:4–5); the third strophe portrays his reception of divine revelation (Sir 39:6–8);⁵⁴ and the final strophe describes the fame that he receives as

⁵⁴ Perdue, "Ben Sira," 140–1, argues that this divine revelation is given to a "select group of sages," since Sir 39:6 indicates that the scribe only receives wisdom if God

a result of his understanding and wisdom (Sir 39:9–11). As in Sir 24:33, the third strophe portrays the revelation that the scribe receives as divinely inspired.⁵⁵ Even as the spirit and word of God provided the prophets with revelation, so the “spirit of understanding” enables the scribe to “pour forth words of wisdom.”⁵⁶ Through the process of studying the scriptures and seeking wisdom, then, the ideal scribe receives divine revelation. Accordingly, his exegetical activities become equivalent to prophetic inspiration.⁵⁷

Although this survey represents but a few examples of how Second Temple Jewish texts portray exegesis as a mode of divine revelation, it shows evidence of a trend that emerged during this period. The Chronicler describes inspired individuals who rework ancient scriptural traditions, the book of Ezra presents the scriptural interpretation of Ezra as analogous to the revelation that ancient prophets receive, and Ben Sira depicts the exegesis of the wise scribe as a revelatory experience. As such, they demonstrate the belief that scriptural exegesis was a divinely inspired activity that stood in continuity with classical prophetic traditions.⁵⁸

is willing to give it to him. Similarly, Helge Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter: Eine Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vor-makkabäischen Sofer unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester-, Propheten- und Weisheitslehrertum* (WUNT 2; Tübingen: J. C. B Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1980), 233, suggests that the gift of revelation applies only to a special group of scribes: “ein Sonderfall des Schriftgelehrtenseins.”

⁵⁵ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 311; Markus N. A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT II.36; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990), 59; Beentjes, “Prophets in Ben Sira,” 146–7.

⁵⁶ Perdue, “Ben Sira,” 139. See also Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*, 2:254, who notes that Ben Sira describes the prophetic inspiration of Elisha in a similar way. Compare the phrase πνεύματι συνέσεως ἐμπλησθήσεται in Sir 39:6 with the phrase Ἐλίσαιε ἐνεπλήσθη πνεύματος αὐτοῦ in Sir 48:12.

⁵⁷ In his discussion of this passage, Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 311, describes the first stage—study of the scriptures—as preparatory for the reception of divine revelation which he identifies as “sapiential revelation.” This suggests that the divine gift of wisdom that the scribe receives is separate from his study and interpretation of the scriptures. Others, however, rightly envision a more fluid relationship between these two stages; through careful study and the divine endowment of “the spirit of understanding,” the scribe discovers the wisdom that lies hidden within the scriptures themselves. According to Mack, *Wisdom*, 99, the discovery of divine wisdom within the ancient texts enables the scribe to declare his own wisdom. Likewise, Perdue, “Ben Sira,” 141, suggests that the phrase “pour forth words of wisdom of his own” (39:6) refers to the scribe’s interpretation of the scriptures as well as his own teachings. The phrase “will glory in the law of the Lord’s covenant” in Sir 39:8b further suggests that the content of the divine wisdom that the scribe receives includes interpretation of the scriptures.

⁵⁸ Note also that a similar transition from oracular prophet to scribal exegete occurs in Greco-Roman literature. See, for example, Mary Beard, “Writing and Religion:

1.4 SCRIPTURAL INTERPRETATION AND COMMUNITY SELF-DEFINITION

The shift from classical prophecy to scriptural interpretation during the Second Temple period heightened the emphasis upon exegesis as a means of attaining revelatory knowledge, but the diversity of perspectives within the Judaism(s) of this era also gave rise to competing views of how to interpret and apply the sacred writ.⁵⁹ In differing ways, certain early Jewish interpreters portray themselves, and the groups they represent, as the exclusive heirs of the Jewish scriptures. Broadly speaking, such attempts at self-definition involve at least one of the following characteristics: 1) descriptions of the elect status and privileged knowledge of the interpreter(s)⁶⁰ and 2) assertions of a direct line of continuity between the revelatory experience of the interpreter(s) and the ancient prophets.⁶¹ These strategies, in turn, play a significant role

Ancient Literacy and the Function of the Written Word in Roman Religion in *Literacy in the Roman World* (Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series III; ed. M. Beard et al. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1991), 35–58; Peter T. Struck, *Birth of the Symbol: Ancient Readers at the Limits of their Texts* (Princeton: PUP, 2004), 162–203; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 452–3; L. Silberman, “Unriddling the Riddle,” *RevQ* 3 (1961): 330–1; A. Finkel, “The Peshier of Dreams and Scriptures,” *RevQ* 4 (1963): 357–70.

⁵⁹ As Hindy Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies,” *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379, notes, the different approaches to scriptural interpretation may also have been due to “diverse views about how to interpret and apply this authoritative writing.”

⁶⁰ For example, Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 346, argues that early Jewish texts highlight the prophetic abilities of particular interpreters. Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 23–75, suggests that certain early Jewish groups and interpreters presented their elite status and access to knowledge as the means by which they understood the Jewish scriptures correctly (see further discussion below in section 1.3 of this chapter). Collins, “Prophecy and Fulfillment,” 311, notes that the Enochic literature predicts the emergence of a “chosen righteous” group that possesses special insight and the book of Daniel similarly describes the *maskilim*. Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing,” 380, outlines the way that the book of *Jubilees* presents its teachings as the “true interpretation of the Torah.”

⁶¹ Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 129–131, argues that certain Second Temple scribal compositions (e.g., Ezra, Ben Sira) closely identify their inspired exegesis with that of the ancient prophets; cf. Beentjes, “Prophets in Ben Sira,” 148–9, who argues that Ben Sira presents himself as an inspired interpreter of prophecy and links his own activities with the prophets. Brooke, “Prophecy,” 154–8, similarly argues that the “parabiblical prophetic rewritings” and Peshier Habakkuk “can be viewed as continuous with the prophetic texts they interpret, and, as such, as a further form of prophecy in their own right” (157). Fraade, “Interpretive Authority,” 50–2, notes the special status of the Teacher of Righteousness as an authoritative interpreter of the scriptures but argues that other Qumran texts place the “collective activity” of Torah-interpretation

in defining community identity since interpreters use such claims to describe themselves and the groups they represent.

Although descriptions of the authoritative exegesis of a particular interpreter, or early Jewish group, occur in a wide variety of early Jewish texts, my discussion throughout the remainder of this chapter will focus upon documents that also express the expectation of an imminent end of the age, especially the literature attributed to the Qumran community. Such texts prove particularly relevant for my study because they often link scriptural interpretation with the end-time emergence of an elect group. As such, they provide a rich source of data for studying the relationship between early Jewish scriptural interpretation and group self-definition.

1.4.1 *Early Jewish Apocalypses*

1.4.1.1 *Daniel 9*

The book of Daniel, especially Daniel 9, illustrates the view that correct understanding of the scriptures requires supernatural revelation. At the opening of Daniel 9, Daniel perceives from his study of the scriptures⁶² that the seventy years of exile prophesied by Jeremiah were coming to a close (Dan 9:1–2; cf. Jer 25:11–12; 29:10). This realization leads him to offer a penitential prayer in which he confesses the sin of Israel (Dan 9:4–10), accepts the disasters that have befallen them as the rightful consequence of their sin (Dan 9:11–14), and petitions God to

“on par with God’s other means of revelation, through His inspired prophets” (52). As Shemesh and Werman, “Halakah,” 108–9, and many others have noted, “pesharim are grounded in the assumption that the prophecies contain information of which the prophets themselves were unaware and whose current and future context only the Teacher of Righteousness can elicit” (108). See also Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 20, 240, 333–62.

⁶² James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927), 360, suggests that ספרים in Dan 9:2 refers to the books of the Prophets. Gerald H. Wilson, “The Prayer of Daniel 9: Reflection on Jeremiah 29,” *JSOT* 48 (1990): 92–3, argues instead that ספרים in Dan 9:2 refers to letters of Jeremiah written during the time of exile. Others suggest that the term refers to a more general body of sacred scriptures. See, e.g., R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1929), 225; Pierre Grelot, “Soixante-dix semaines d’années,” *Bib* 50 (1969): 169; Louis F. Hartman and Alexander Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB 23; Garden City: Doubleday, 1978), 241. The context seems to suggest a collection of sacred writings, whether of prophets or a larger body of material.

restore the nation (Dan 9:15–19).⁶³ Although the prayer has a decidedly Deuteronomistic perspective, the answer that Daniel receives reorients this theological viewpoint, and provides a different understanding of how and when the prophecy of Jeremiah would be fulfilled.⁶⁴ While Daniel is still in prayer, the angel Gabriel arrives and explains that the prophecy will be realized at a pre-determined time in the eschatological future (Dan 9:20–27). The message of Gabriel thus provides the additional information needed to interpret the prophecy of Jeremiah correctly: the seventy years of exile refer to seventy weeks of years. As such, his message represents a form of revelatory exegesis that explains how Jeremiah's words apply to the defeat of Antiochus Epiphanes and the end of the present age.⁶⁵

⁶³ Although Daniel never requests divine assistance to understand the prophecy of Jeremiah in this prayer, some suggest that the prayer nevertheless represents a request for exegetical illumination, since the act of fasting (Dan 9:3) can be used as preparation for revelation (cf. Dan 10:2–3; Ex 34:28; Deut 9:9; 4 Ezra 5:13, 20) and since the verb *בִּקֵּשׁ* can refer to seeking God for revelation (Amos 8:12; 2 Sam 21:2; Hos 5:15). See, e.g., Montgomery, *Daniel*, 360; Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 241, 245; John E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30; Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 253; André Lacocque, "The Liturgical Prayer in Daniel 9," *HUCA* 47 (1976): 121. Others rightly argue that the primary purpose of the prayer is penitential. See, e.g., John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 349; Raymond Hammer, *The Book of Daniel* (CBCOT; Cambridge: CUP, 1976), 46–7; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 217. According to Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 488–9, the purpose of Daniel's prayer was not just to signal that the punishment of Israel was complete but to provide hope that repentance would bring their captivity to an end. Similarly, Norman W. Porteous, *Daniel: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), 138, suggests that the phrase "the curse and the oath written in the law of Moses" in Dan 9:11 refers to Num 5:21, Lev 26:14–39, and Deut 28:15–68. Daniel's belated act of confession is the proper Deuteronomistic response that leads to renewal of hope.

⁶⁴ Collins, *Daniel*, 347–8, suggests that a key issue in the modern interpretation of Daniel 9 relates to the seemingly contradictory relationship between Daniel's prayer (vv. 4–19) and the rest of Daniel 9. The prayer expresses a Deuteronomistic perspective, is written in fluent Hebrew, and uses terminology not found elsewhere in Daniel. By contrast, the rest of the chapter is written in difficult Hebrew, contains frequent Aramaisms, and communicates a deterministic outlook. For further discussion of these differences, see, e.g., Charles, *Daniel*, 226; L. H. Ginzberg, *Studies in Daniel* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1948), 33, 41; Montgomery, *Daniel*, 362; Lacocque, "Liturgical Prayer," 119–42; Porteous, *Daniel*, 135–6; Goldingay, *Daniel*, 236–7; Bruce William Jones, "The Prayer in Daniel IX," *VT* 18 (1968): 488–93; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 4.

⁶⁵ A primary difference between the initial interpretation of Daniel and the exegesis provided by Gabriel lies in Gabriel's isolation of and focus upon the interpretation of the 70 years as 70 weeks of years. This exegetical method, which is often called 'atomization', is a common characteristic of *pesharim*. See Shani L. Berrin, *The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169* (STDJ 53; Leiden: Brill,

The author of the book of Daniel also attempts to demonstrate the divine origins of this scriptural interpretation. For example, by having an angelic emissary communicate the exegetical explanation of the prophecy, the author sets the interpretation apart as one that originates from God himself. Moreover, as Jassen observes, by using the term “word” to refer both to the message of Gabriel (דָּבָר; Dan 9:23) and the message that came to Jeremiah (דְּבַר יְהוָה; Dan 9:2, 25), the author draws an implicit connection between the revelatory exegesis of Gabriel and the original prophetic message.⁶⁶ By conceptualizing the interpretation that Gabriel provides as a prophetic word, the author of Daniel shows his scriptural interpretation to be continuous with and the proper realization of the message of Jeremiah.⁶⁷ Essentially, it infuses the new exegetical revelation with a status commensurate with the earlier prophetic oracle.⁶⁸

Yet the “wisdom and understanding” that the message of Gabriel provides corresponds to gifts of divine insight that Daniel already possessed. Compare, for example, Gabriel’s declaration that he had come forth to cause Daniel to know and understand (לְהַשְׁכִּיל בִּינָה) in Dan 9:22 with the description of Daniel and his friends: “To these

2004), 12–23; Armin Lange, “Reading the Decline of Prophecy” in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (SBLSymS 30; ed. K. de Troyer and A. Lange; Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 186–9; Collins, “Prophecy and Fulfillment,” 302; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 220. For further discussion of the 70 weeks of years in Daniel, see Goldingay, *Daniel*, 257; Porteous, *Daniel*, 141; Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 250–1; Antti Laato, “The Seventy Yearweeks in the Book of Daniel,” *ZAW* 102 (1990): 212–23. For a discussion of the influence of the sabbatical theology of Leviticus 25–26 on the formulation of an extended period that would include seventy sabbatical years, see Collins, *Daniel*, 352; Montgomery, *Daniel*, 373; Grelot, “Soixante-dix semaines,” 178–81; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 482–4. Collins, *Daniel*, 353–4, also suggests that the division of history into ten weeks or seventy periods in Enochic literature may have influenced the author of Daniel.

⁶⁶ Although most commentators suggest that דָּבָר in Dan 9:23 refers to Jeremiah’s prophecy (e.g., Montgomery, *Daniel*, 371; Porteous, *Daniel*, 139; Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 242; Collins, *Daniel*, 352), Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 218, rightly argues that the term דָּבָר refers to the message of Gabriel rather than to the original word of Jeremiah. In Dan 9:23, Gabriel clearly represents דָּבָר as the message that “went forth” from God through Gabriel when Daniel first began to pray.

⁶⁷ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 218–20; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 484.

⁶⁸ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 272, also argues that Daniel is a paradigmatic example of the “newly emerging Second Temple period prophetic figure. His revelation is experienced through the reading and rewriting of earlier prophetic traditions as well as the receipt of revealed wisdom. These newer revelatory models are integrated into dreams and visions that Daniel experiences.”

four young men God gave knowledge and skill (מדע והשכל) in every aspect of literature and wisdom; Daniel also had insight (הבין) into all visions and dreams” (Dan 1:17; cf. 2:30; 7:15–16; 8:15–17; 9:13, 22, 25). Furthermore, in Dan 9:23–25, Gabriel commands Daniel to “discern” (ובין, “understand” (והבין), “know” (ותדע) and “consider” (ותשכל) the explanation of the prophecy. Gabriel gives wisdom and understanding that enables Daniel to interpret the prophecy but Daniel also possesses gifts of wisdom and insight that assist him in comprehending such messages from God.⁶⁹ In this sense, Daniel’s special capacity to discern other mysteries, together with the mediating message of Gabriel, serve to demonstrate the authority of his divinely-inspired interpretation of Jeremiah.

These claims to authoritative exegesis and insight also appear to define a wider group. In his *ex eventu* predictions, the author links the wisdom and insight of Daniel with a later generation of “enlightened ones” (משכלים; 11:33, 35; 12:3, 10), and portrays this group as heirs to his revelatory knowledge. In Dan 12:4 and 9, Daniel is instructed to “seal the book” of his revelations until the “end of time.” In this final era, the angel explains, “Many shall be purified, cleansed, and refined, but the wicked shall continue to act wickedly. None of the wicked shall understand, but those who are wise shall understand (והמשכלים יבינו)” (Dan 12:10). The author thus identifies a group of “enlightened ones” who gain access to the revelation that Daniel had received and reportedly “hidden and sealed.”⁷⁰ Through their eschatological gift of insight, the *maskilim* give understanding to many (ומשכילי עם יבינו) (לרבים) (Dan 11:32–33; cf. 12:3, 10). This knowledge and wisdom of the *maskilim* also sets them apart from those who forsake and act wickedly toward the covenant (Dan 11:30, 32–33).⁷¹ In this sense, Daniel’s

⁶⁹ Daniel’s dreams, visions, and interpretation of the prophetic writings are conceptualized as similar types of revelatory experiences. Note that the same verb “to understand” (בין) is used in each of these contexts (Dan 1:17; 8:5; 9:23; 10:11; cf. 8:27). For further discussion, see Hammer, *Daniel*, 94; Goldingay, *Daniel*, 231; Collins, “Jewish Apocalypticism,” 70; idem, “Prophecy and Fulfillment,” 305; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 217.

⁷⁰ As Collins, “Prophecy and Fulfillment,” 306, notes, the author of Daniel provides an *ex eventu* overview of history so that his interpretations of Jeremiah’s prophecy and Daniel’s visions fit the pattern of historical apocalypses.

⁷¹ For further discussion of the *maskilim* in Daniel, see Collins, *Daniel*, 66–7, 341–2, 384–5, 403; André Lacocque, *Daniel in His Time* (Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament; Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1988), 189–95. Goldingay,

privileged wisdom and understanding of the Jewish scriptures serves to characterize the identity of a certain group of Jews. This group, in turn, provides wise teachers who disclose the proper perspective of God's will and plan during this end-time era.⁷²

1.4.1.2 1 Enoch

Since 1 Enoch never explicitly quotes or paraphrases biblical passages,⁷³ detecting and evaluating the use of scripture in this collection presents a challenge. Because the author allegedly lived long before the composition of any authoritative texts, it is perhaps not surprising that the Enochic collection does not explicitly refer to the Jewish scriptures. Nevertheless, the authors of 1 Enoch implicitly depend upon scriptural traditions, and expand them to address concerns of their own time.⁷⁴ For

Daniel, 303, suggests that the use of the *hiphil* form of בָּרַךְ to describe the teaching of the *maskilim* refers to their scriptural interpretation. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 489–93, also suggests that the *maskilim* were a community of interpreters with a special ability to understand ancient prophecy. See his discussion of Dan 11:10, 22, 26–27, 30–31, 33, 35–36, 40, 45; 12:1–4, 7, 9–10, 12.

⁷² Collins, *Daniel*, 392–4, 402–3; cf., Lacocque, *Daniel*, 189–95. Although this scribal group falls victim to persecution (Dan 11:33–35), the author predicts that, at the appointed time, they will experience resurrection and “lead many to righteousness” (Dan 12:3).

⁷³ George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 57.

⁷⁴ Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 7. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 57–8, notes the numerous points at which 1 Enoch depends upon scripture but argues that the nature of this dependence is not always clear. He maintains that the Enochic collection does not cite scriptural passages explicitly because it claims to be authoritative scripture that depends not upon inspired texts but upon direct revelations that the primordial Enoch received; cf. idem, “Scripture in 1 Enoch,” 342–6. Annette Yoshiko Reed, “‘Revealed Literature’ in the Second Century BCE,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 94–8, argues that scholars wrongly interpret the revelatory claims of texts such as 1 Enoch 1–36 as an attempt “to supplant” older revelatory literature. In *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005), 145, Reed further points out that works like 1 Enoch 1–36 draw “their legitimacy” from the Jewish scriptures. For example, 1 Enoch 1–36 appeals to biblical figures, mimics the biblical language and style of the scriptures, and relies upon the biblical record of history. For further discussion of the use of scripture in 1 Enoch, see Kenneth E. Pomykala, “A Scripture Profile of the Book of the Watchers,” in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (BibInt 28; ed. Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 263–84; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 265; James C. VanderKam, “Biblical Interpretation in 1 Enoch and Jubilees” in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup 14; Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 96–125.

example, the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks contain reviews of biblical history that undoubtedly depend upon the Jewish scriptures. Within the context of 1 Enoch, it is possible to understand these historical reviews as interpretive readings of biblical history. Moreover, the authority of these interpretive readings is established through the argument that they form part of the revelation originally given to Enoch.⁷⁵

Not only do the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks present their particular interpretations of biblical history; both also provide evidence of the belief that an elect and righteous group would arise to become the recipients of special revelation at the end of the age.⁷⁶ The Apocalypse of Weeks divides human history into ten periods of time, designated as “ten weeks,” beginning with the time of Enoch. It opens by having Enoch state that his discourse concerns a select group: “the children of righteousness,” “the elect of the world,” and “the plant of uprightness” (1 En. 93:2). The seventh week represents the climax of biblical history at which time the elect righteous ones appear:

- (8) After this there will arise a sixth week and all who live in it will become blind, and the hearts of all will stray from wisdom; and in it a man will ascend.

And at its conclusion, the temple of the kingdom will be burned with fire, and in it the whole race of the chosen root will be dispersed.

- (9) After this, in the seventh week, there will arise a perverse generation, and many will be its deeds, and all its deeds will be perverse.

⁷⁵ As Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 267, notes, the Apocalypse of Weeks begins by referring to the revelation that he received from the “heavenly tablets” (1 En. 93:1–2). According to Jassen, this “revelatory encounter” forms the basis of his claim to possess knowledge about the “ultimate fate of the righteous” (268); cf. James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 150–1. Similarly, the Animal Apocalypse begins by describing the revelation therein as a dream vision (1 En. 85:1–2). See also Patrick A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (SBLEJL 4; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993), 22, who suggests that the Animal Apocalypse reviews events from Genesis 1 to Ezra-Nehemiah from the perspective of “divine and angelic activity.”

⁷⁶ For further discussion of the parallels between the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 399–400.

- (10) And at its conclusion, the chosen will be chosen, as witnesses of righteousness from the everlasting plant of righteousness, to whom will be given sevenfold wisdom and knowledge.⁷⁷
(1 En. 93:8–10)⁷⁸

The sixth week and the beginning of the seventh week represent the period leading up to and following the Babylonian exile (1 En. 93:8–9). The author emphasizes the apostasy of Israel during this stage and characterizes it as a season of blindness and lack of wisdom. From this wicked generation, however, a particular group of righteous ones emerges to receive “sevenfold wisdom and knowledge.”

The description of the election of the righteous group, in the seventh week, parallels the description of the election of Abraham in the third week. Following a post diluvian period of evil, Abraham was “elected as the plant of righteous judgment,” and his offspring became “the plant of righteousness” (1 En. 93:5). Accordingly, in the same way that Abraham was selected from an evil group of humans to become a righteous plant, so a certain group of righteous Jews is later selected from apostate Israel to become the end-time continuation of the “plant of righteousness” that originally began with Abraham.⁷⁹ From the perspective of the author, then, this newly constituted group represents true Israel.⁸⁰ Furthermore, the author indicates that this community emerged with the express purpose of receiving divine gifts of wisdom and knowledge.⁸¹

⁷⁷ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 436, provides the English translation “sevenfold wisdom and knowledge” but notes that the Ethiopic has the phrase “sevenfold wisdom concerning all his creation.” J. T. Milik, ed. and trans., *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 265, presents the Aramaic text as שבעה פ[עמ]ין חכמה ומדע.

⁷⁸ Citations of 1 Enoch are from the translation provided by George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation Based on the Hermeneia Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004).

⁷⁹ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 445–8, notes that the Apocalypse of Weeks refers to the plant four times (93:2, 5, 8, 10). Although the original plant represents historical Israel, “the eternal plant of righteousness” that is chosen in the seventh week represents only a select group of Jews.

⁸⁰ For a discussion of the possibility that the description of an elect righteous group in 1 Enoch refers to a particular community, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 64–7; Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 109–15.

⁸¹ Undoubtedly, the wisdom and knowledge that the elect receive relates to the divine revelations that were given to Enoch (see, e.g., 1 En. 93:2). Elsewhere in the Enochic collection, the authors indicate that this heavenly wisdom has life-giving power (e.g., 1 En. 82:1–4) and produces joy and uprightness (e.g., 1 En. 104:12–13).

Like the Apocalypse of Weeks, the Animal Apocalypse provides a review of history that climaxes with the election of a particular group of Jews who receive divine revelation. Throughout the account, the authors allegorically portray Israel as sheep, and their altering states of apostasy and fidelity as blindness and eyesight, respectively. According to James C. VanderKam, the first description of Israel's eye-opening recounts the revelation given at Sinai after the deliverance from Egypt: "But the sheep escaped from that water and went forth into a wilderness, where there was no water and no grass; and they began to open their eyes and to see" (1 En. 89:28).⁸² Shortly thereafter, however, the majority of the sheep become blind as a result of the golden calf episode (1 En. 89:32–34), and experience alternating periods of vision and blindness during the period of the Judges (1 En. 89:41, 44). Further blindness occurs through subsequent apostasy (89:54),⁸³ and the authors even depict the return from Babylon and the rebuilding of the Temple as a period of ongoing blindness (89:59, 74; 90:2).⁸⁴ Finally,

Nickelsburg, "Nature and Function of Revelation," 95, also argues that the sevenfold wisdom and knowledge described in 1 En. 93:10 included revealed instruction about "the right life, i.e., Torah and ethics." Since this wisdom functions as the antidote to the blindness and apostasy of Israel, moreover, in all probability it includes a revelation of how to obey Torah.

⁸² Scholars have linked the first opening of the eyes of Israel, described in 1 En. 89:28, to a number of different events. François Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch: Documents pour l'étude de la Bible, traduit sur le texte éthiopien* (Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1906), 209, and Günter Reese, "Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des frühen Judentums: Eine Untersuchung der Tiervision und der Zehnwochenapokalypse des äthiopischen Henochbuches, der Geschichtsdarstellung der Assumptio Mosis und der des 4 Esrabuches" (PhD diss., Ruprecht-Karl-Universität zu Heidelberg, 1967), 34, suggest that it refers to Exod 14:31, where Israel sees the power of God in delivering Israel from the Egyptians. Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 292, suggests that it refers to Exod 15:25b–26, where the emphasis rests upon keeping the commands of God. James C. VanderKam, "Open and Closed Eyes in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85–90)," in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel* (JSJSup 83; ed. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 286–92, suggests that the eye-opening described in 1 En. 89:28 refers to the Sinai event itself, specifically to the point at which Israel sees God (e.g., Exod 19:11; 24:9–10a). This latter argument, in addition to VanderKam's discussion of the etymology of the word Israel ("one who sees God"), provides the best explanation of the referent of 1 En. 89:28.

⁸³ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 384, links 1 En. 89:54–58 with the reign of Manasseh, but VanderKam, "Open and Closed Eyes," 283, links 1 En. 89:54 more closely to the apostasy of the Northern Kingdom. As Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 316, notes, the period described in 1 En. 89:51–58 appears to include "the whole period from Rehoboam to Jehoiakim" and "is summarized as a period of apostasy and destruction."

⁸⁴ For further discussion, see Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 282–3, 340. He suggests that the authors of the Animal Apocalypse portray the circumstances after the exile as worse than before it began.

in what appears to be an account of the authors' own time period,⁸⁵ they refer to sheep who begin to open their eyes:

(6) And look, lambs were born of those white sheep, and they (an elect group of Jews) began to open their eyes and to see, and to cry out to the sheep. (7) But they did not listen to them nor attend to their words, but they were extremely deaf, and their eyes were extremely and excessively blinded. (8) And I saw in the vision that the ravens (non-Jewish opponents) flew upon those lambs and seized one of those lambs, and dashed the sheep in pieces and devoured them. (9) And I saw until horns came out on those lambs, and the ravens were casting down their horns. And I saw until a great horn sprouted on one of those sheep (probably Judas Maccabeus). (10) And it looked on them, and their eyes were opened.⁸⁶ (1 En. 90:6–10a)

This passage represents a significant turning point in the allegory since the eye-opening of an elect group marks a new beginning for Israel that culminates in the end of the age (1 En. 90:20–38). Furthermore, the description of eye-opening parallels the revelation given at Sinai,⁸⁷ which strongly suggests that the authors wish to depict Jews who receive this illumination as those who gain a renewed understanding of Mosaic law.⁸⁸ The event thus binds the election of a select group of Jews to their reception of an end-time revelation of the true meaning of Mosaic law. By contrast, other Jews become exceedingly deaf and blind and therefore separate from the elect.⁸⁹

⁸⁵ Apparently, this represents the time of Seleucid domination and the rise of the Maccabees. So Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 350–6; VanderKam, "Open and Closed Eyes," 284; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 400–1.

⁸⁶ Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 356, maintains that the eye-opening of certain Jews in 1 En. 90:9–10 depicts a religious reformation involving more Jews than the ones described in 90:6.

⁸⁷ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 398, notes that the Ethiopic wording in 1 En. 90:6 parallels the wording of 89:28, thereby drawing a close connection between these two events.

⁸⁸ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 381; VanderKam, "Open and Closed Eyes," 292. Similarly, Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 292, argues that the accounts of eye-opening in the *Animal Apocalypse* depict "possession of God's law and obedience to it."

⁸⁹ The author goes on to describe a final battle in which angels help the elect. After the battle, blind Jews and wicked non-Jews are judged. Subsequently, the eschatological Temple descends and the remaining sheep (Jews) and beasts of the field (non-Jews) are gathered into the Temple. This remaining group, which apparently includes non-Jews, then has a similar revelatory experience: "And the eyes of them all were opened, and they saw the good, and there was not one among them that did not see" (1 En. 90:35–36). Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 382, posits that this imagery also suggests a return to "the way shown by Moses" (382).

Presented as predictions of the future, the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks aim to provide their readers with historical reviews that provide a particular perspective on biblical history. Implicitly, this privileged viewpoint is shown to be authoritative through the claim that these texts record the angelic revelations that Enoch received and passed down to subsequent generations (e.g., 85:1–2; 93:1–2). Yet the two accounts also portray wisdom and correct Torah-interpretation as eschatological gifts that only elect Jews possess.⁹⁰ From this perspective, the accounts present the knowledge of a particular group as a manifestation of the final intervention of God. Their divinely-bestowed gifts of revelation confirm their elect status as the chosen remnant and renewed Israel.⁹¹

⁹⁰ Nickelsburg, “Revealed Wisdom,” 76–9, observes that the wisdom described in the Enochic collection has an “eschatological dimension” insofar as “it is God’s gift in preparation for the end” (77). He argues that the books of Enoch often present insiders as the righteous, pious, and chosen, whose “status is related to their possession of revealed, eschatological wisdom about God’s Law and imminent judgment”; cf. idem, “The Nature and Function of Revelation,” 92–101; idem, “Scripture in 1 Enoch” 333–54. See also Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 46–7.

⁹¹ Although the precise historical identity of the righteous elect described in these apocalypses remains difficult to determine, a number of scholars recognize that some parts of the Enochic collection appear to attest to the existence of a historical group or community. As Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 64, states: “The existence of a community or communities associated with the Enochic literature seems a reasonable inference from the existence of the texts and the development of the corpus.” John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 70–4, remains cautious about identifying the community with a particular historical group but still recognizes that the emergence of a movement in the Apocalypse of Weeks and the Animal Apocalypse is “clearly attested” (74) and should be correlated with developments in the book of *Jubilees* and the Damascus Document. Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Partings of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 16, 165–96, argues that “Enochic Judaism is the modern name for the mainstream body of the Essene party, from which the Qumran community parted as a radical, dissident, and marginal offspring” (16). Shemesh and Werman, “Halakhah,” 105–6, argue that the Animal Apocalypse may symbolically depict the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness “whose eyes were opened to the correct interpretation of Torah”; cf. M. Kister, “Concerning the History of the Essenes,” *Tarbiz* 56 (1986): 1–15; Devorah Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; ed. Michael E. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 544–5. Matthew Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 275, associates this group with the *Hasidim* described in 1 Macc. 2:42, 7:12–14, and 2 Macc. 14:1, or the *Maskilim* of Daniel 11–12. As Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 109–16, rightly cautions, however, the evidence used to support these theories of provenance is not conclusive. He suggests that a reform movement arose early in the second century BCE which could have “spawned several smaller communities” (116). In his view, these

The Epistle of Enoch develops this perspective further through a series of contrasts. It describes a conflict between the wicked and the righteous, and distinguishes between these two groups on the basis of their acceptance or rejection of the knowledge offered by “the wise.” Fools do not heed the wise and therefore do not receive salvation (1 En. 98:9–10) whereas those who listen to the wise “learn to do the commandments of the Most High” and so are saved (1 En. 99:10). Wise sages also stand in contrast to false teachers who “alter the true words and pervert the everlasting covenant” (99:2; cf. 98:14–16).⁹² These contrasts further define group identity with reference to wisdom and Torah interpretation: those who receive, or adopt, the privileged knowledge provided by the Enochic collection become part of the elect whereas those who reject it are excluded.

1.4.2 *Qumran Literature*

1.4.2.1 *Pesher Habakkuk (1QpHab)*

As we have seen, a number of Second Temple Jewish texts present ancient biblical prophecy as a written repository of revelation about the future (e.g., Daniel 9).⁹³ From this perspective, the task of the interpreter involves gaining an understanding of the relevance of prophecy to contemporary circumstances.⁹⁴ The *peshtarim* texts from Qumran exemplify this exegetical process since they attempt to correlate ancient prophecy with present and eschatological events.⁹⁵ Pesher Habakkuk,

smaller groups shared the same background but separated and produced texts which were distinct to their own groups.

⁹² George W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Epistle of Enoch and the Qumran Literature,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 334–40.

⁹³ On the similarities between pesher and the interpretation of Jeremiah in Daniel 9, see O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1960), 80–1; William Hugh Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (Missoula: Scholars, 1979), 29; Maurya P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979), 255–6; Collins, “Prophecy and Fulfillment,” 304–7.

⁹⁴ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 346; cf. Aune, “Charismatic Exegesis,” 133–4; Barton, *Oracles*, 180–1; Nickelsburg, “Revealed Wisdom,” 81; Betz, *Offenbarung*, 36–59; Collins, “Prophecy and Fulfillment,” 303.

⁹⁵ K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (BHT 15; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953), 150, stresses that the primary hermeneutical principle underlying the *peshtarim* is that prophecies refer to the end time and that time is now. Some NT scholars contrast the Qumran community’s expectation of a future salvation with the emphasis upon the present salvation described in early Christian texts. See, e.g., O. Betz, “Past Events and Last Events in Qumran Interpretation of

in particular, applies the prophecies of Habakkuk to the experiences and expectations of the Qumran group. Since this text also contains a number of self-conscious reflections of the interpretive activity of the Teacher of Righteousness, it provides significant information about the defining role that his exegesis played in the community.⁹⁶

Two key passages in 1QpHab disclose important details about the authoritative status of the scriptural interpretation of the Teacher of Righteousness. The first, 1QpHab 1:16–2:10, outlines what appears to be three sets of opponents and explains the contrast between their error and his privileged insight:

History,” *WCJS* 6 (1977): 27–34; F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), 68. Nevertheless, as Annette Steudel, “אחרית הימים in Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16 (1993–94): 225–46, has demonstrated, the “end of days” at Qumran can include past, present, and future events; eschatological time does not always refer only to the future. See also Shani Berrin, “Qumran Pesharim,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 118–26.

⁹⁶ Early scholars of the Dead Sea Scrolls, such as J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (trans. J. Strugnell; Naperville: Alec Allenson, 1959), 11, regarded Peshar Habakkuk as an autograph, but this assumption has since been refuted. See, e.g., Horgan, *Pesharim*, 3–4. Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1994), 226, suggests that Peshar Habakkuk was composed around 84–63 BCE but attempts to depict the earlier history of the sect. Similarly, Hartmut Stegemann, *On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (The Library of Qumran; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 131–2, maintains that Peshar Habakkuk provides key information about the Teacher of Righteousness and the founding of the community in response to the rise of the Hasmonean dynasty (150 BCE), but argues that it was actually written much later (54 BCE). See also the discussion of the perfect and imperfect forms in Peshar Habakkuk by Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “Temporal Shifts from Text to Interpretation: Concerning the Use of the Perfect and Imperfect in the *Habakkuk Peshar* (1QpHab),” in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches New Questions* (ed. Michael Thomas Davis and Brent A. Strawn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 124–49. The precise historical time frame of the text remains difficult to determine since Peshar Habakkuk contains no real historical names. Moshe J. Bernstein, “Peshar Habakkuk,” in the *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; New York: OUP, 2000), 649–50, discusses the complexities associated with dating the text but notes that the vast majority of scholars identify the *Kittim* as Romans and conclude that Peshar Habakkuk was written around the time that Pompey took Jerusalem (63 BCE). Nevertheless, the inner-Jewish conflict that Peshar Habakkuk describes could refer to the early part of the Hasmonean era, rather than to the time of Alexander Jannaeus. Brownlee, *Midrash Peshar*, 23, argues that the text could have been written earlier and predicted the Roman invasion of Palestine. In Brownlee’s view, the references to the Romans are sufficiently ambiguous to make an earlier date in the second century BCE possible.

- 1:16 [ראו...בוגדים והביטו]⁹⁷
 1:17 [והתמהו תמהו כִּי פֶעַל פֹּעֵל בִּימִיכָם לֹא תִאֲמִינוּ כִּי־א] וְהַתְּמָהוּ תִּמְהוּ כִּי פֶעַל פֹּעֵל בִּימִיכָם לֹא תִאֲמִינוּ כִּי־א
 2:1 [סופר vacat...] פֶּשֶׁר הַדְּבָר עַל־הַבּוֹגְדִים עִם אִישׁ
 2:2 הַכּוֹב כִּי לֹא־הָאֲמִינוּ בְּדִבְרֵי מוֹרֵה הַצִּדְקָה מִפִּי
 2:3 אֶל וְעַל הַבּוֹגְדִים בְּבְרִית הַחֲדָשָׁה כִּי־א לֹא
 2:4 הָאֲמִינוּ בְּבְרִית אֶל [וַיַּחֲלִלוּ] אֶת שְׁם [קוֹדֶשׁ]
 2:5 וְכֵן vacat פֶּשֶׁר הַדְּבָר [עַל הַבּוֹגְדִים לְאַחֲרִית־א] <
 2:6 הַיָּמִים הַמָּה עֲרִיצִים בְּבְרִית־א⁹⁸ אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִאֲמִינוּ
 2:7 בְּשׁוֹמֵעַם אֶת כּוֹל הַבְּאִי־וֹת עַל־הַדּוֹר הָאַחֲרוֹן מִפִּי
 2:8 הַכּוֹהֵן אֲשֶׁר נָתַן אֶל בְּלָבוֹ בִּינָה⁹⁹ לְפֶשֶׁר אֶת כּוֹל
 2:9 דְּבָרֵי עֲבָדָיו הַנְּבִיאִים אֲשֶׁר [בִּידֵם סִפֵּר אֶל אֶת
 2:10a כּוֹל הַבְּאִי־וֹת עַל עַמּוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל]
- 1:16 [Look, you traitors and behold]
 1:17 [and be astonished, amazed, for I am doing a work in your days
 you would not believe if]
 2:1 it was declared. vacat [the interpretation of the word concerns]
 the traitors together with the Man of
 2:2 the Lie, because they did not [believe in the words of] the
 Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of
 2:3 God. And it concerns the traito[rs to] the new [covenant], si[n]ce
 they did not
 2:4 believe in the covenant of God [and have profaned] his holy
 na[me].

⁹⁷ This reconstruction of the lemma—Hab 1:5—presents the phrase “upon the nations” (בְּגוֹיִם) in the MT as “traitors” (בּוֹגְדִים). Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 31, suggests that בּוֹגְדִים occurred in the *Vorlage* that the pesherist used; cf. Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 54. For further discussion, see William H. Brownlee, *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran* (JBLMS 11; Philadelphia: SBL, 1959); Silberman, “Riddle,” 335–6.

⁹⁸ The restoration (עֲרִיצִים בְּבְרִית־א) was first proposed by Erik Sjöberg, “The Restoration of Column II of the Habakkuk Commentary of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *ST* 4 (1952): 121–7. Isaac Rabinowitz, “The Second and Third Columns of the Habakkuk Interpretation Scroll,” *JBL* 69 (1950): 41, however, reconstructs the phrase as עֲרִיצִי הָאֲוִי־וֹת (“the ruth[less of the nati]ons”). I am following Sjöberg’s reconstruction (עֲרִיצִים בְּבְרִית־א) since there is nothing in the context to suggest that the third group is not Jewish. Compare also Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:12.

⁹⁹ Although Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:12, represent 1QpHab 2:8 as “the priest whom God has placed wi[thin the Commun]ity” (הַכּוֹהֵן אֲשֶׁר נָתַן) (אֶל בְּלָבוֹ בִּינָה), I am following a number of scholars who reconstruct the phrase as הַכּוֹהֵן אֲשֶׁר נָתַן אֶל בְּלָבוֹ בִּינָה. See, e.g., Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 53; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 30. Rabinowitz, “Columns,” 33, supplies חֲכָמָה rather than בִּינָה, but the sense of the phrase remains the same. For a discussion of this and other possible reconstructions, see Bilha Nitzan, *Megillat Pesher Habakkuk* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986), 152. Shemesh and Werman, “Halakah,” 108, similarly argue that 1QpHab 2:8–10 indicates that God gave the Teacher of Righteousness the “requisite tools to interpret the words of the prophets”; cf. Fraade, “Interpretive Authority,” 50.

- 2:5 And thus *vacat* the interpretation of the word [concerns the traitors in the end of
 2:6 days. They are the ruthless [ones of the cove]nant who will not believe
 2:7 when they hear all that is going to co[me up]on the final generation from the mouth of
 2:8 the priest¹⁰⁰ in whose [heart] God placed [discernme]nt to interpret¹⁰¹ all
 2:9 the words of his servants the prophets, through [whom] God declared
 2:10a all that is coming upon his people Isr[ael].
 (1QpHab 1:16–2:10)

The pesherist emphatically affirms the authority of the Teacher's exegesis by describing its divine origin. He indicates that the words of the Teacher came "from the mouth of God" (1QpHab 2:2–3) and explains that he arrived at a correct understanding of the scriptures through a divine revelatory process: God placed understanding into his heart to interpret (לפֿשור) all the words of the prophets (1QpHab 2:8). Although the passage does not define the exegetical method of the Teacher, it clearly portrays his interpretation as one that originated from God.¹⁰²

The description of the Teacher in 1QpHab 2:1–10 corresponds closely to the one in 1QpHab 7:1–5. In this latter passage, the pesherist again takes extra care in outlining the divine origin of his exclusive understanding of Habakkuk:

- 7:1 וידבר אל אֵל חֲבִיקוֹק לְכַתּוֹב אֶת הַבְּאוֹת עַל
 7:2 <עַל>¹⁰³ הַדּוֹר הָאַחֲרוֹן וְאֵת גִּמְרֵי הַקֶּץ לֹא הוֹדִיעוּ
 7:3 וַאֲשֶׁר אָמַר לְמַעַן יִרְוֶיךָ הַקּוֹרָא בּוֹ
 7:4 פֶּשֶׁר עַל מוֹרָה הַצֶּדֶק אֲשֶׁר הוֹדִיעוּ אֵל אֶת
 7:5a כּוֹל רִזֵּי דְבָרֵי עֲבָדָיו הַנְּבִאִים

¹⁰⁰ In this context, the "priest" refers to the Teacher. So Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 57; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 32; Aune, "Charismatic Exegesis," 134; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 225.

¹⁰¹ Although the infinitive construct לפֿשור can be translated simply as "to interpret," Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 57, renders it more elaborately as "to give prophetic meaning." He does so because this verb is a cognate of the noun פֶּשֶׁר which, in his view, here refers to the "secret prophetic meaning which only an inspired interpreter may expound" (57).

¹⁰² Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 351–2.

¹⁰³ The doubling of the preposition עַל at the end of line 1 and the beginning of line 2 appears to be a result of dittography.

- 7:1 and God told Habakkuk to write what was coming upon
 7:2 upon the last generation, but he did not make known to him the
 final end.
 7:3 *vacat* And when it says, “so that the one who reads it may run”
 7:4 its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom
 God has made known
 7:5a all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets.
 (1QpHab 7:1–5a)

Here the pesherist emphasizes the authority of the Teacher by juxtaposing his knowledge with that of the prophet Habakkuk. Whereas God spoke through Habakkuk, he did not make known to him (לוא הודיעו)¹⁰⁴ how the prophecy would be fulfilled at the final end of time (גמר הקץ).¹⁰⁵ By contrast, God did make known (הודיעו) the mysteries of such prophecies to the Teacher. What the prophet merely recorded as a mystery, then, God enabled the Teacher to decode and apply to the final generation.¹⁰⁶ This description demonstrates that the divinely inspired interpretation of the Teacher stands in direct continuity with

¹⁰⁴ 1QpHab 7:2 has the *hiphil* form of ידע (with the third masculine singular pronoun) written defectively: הודיעו. Compare this with the full orthography in 1QpHab 7:4 (הודיעו).

¹⁰⁵ A number of scholars interpret the phrase גמר הקץ as a reference to the final end of time. See, e.g., the translations in Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (England: Clays Ltd., 2004), 512, “when time would come to an end”; Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:17, “the consummation of the era”; Horgan, *Pesharim*, 37, “the fulfillment of the end-time.” This meaning may suggest that 7:1–2 indicates that God did not reveal the timing of the end to the prophet Habakkuk. Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 110, argues that the phrase גמר הקץ in 1QpHab 7:2 should be translated “fullness of that time” because it indicates that Habakkuk only received a partial revelation of “the entire content to which the enigmatic words relate” (110). Accordingly, the mysteries of the prophecy and its true meaning were left for the Teacher to uncover; cf. Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 348–9, who argues that the description of the knowledge of the Teacher must be understood “in opposition to the... seemingly unintelligible nature of the prophetic pronouncements” (348).

¹⁰⁶ The phrase “all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets” (כול רזי עבדיו הנבאים) suggests that the message of the prophets in some way needed to be deciphered. Compare the use of the Aramaic רז in Dan 2:18, 19, 27, 29, 30, 47; 4:6 to refer to mysteries that need interpretation or decoding (פשר; Dan 2:4–5; 4:9). The passage thus indicates that the inspired exegesis of the Teacher was essential to the proper understanding of the prophets. See Horgan, *Pesharim*, 37–8, 237; Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 112–3; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 353. A number of scholars suggest that Near Eastern dream interpretation provided the foundation of pesher exegesis; a pesherist could regard the biblical text as a mysterious source of information that required decoding even as mysterious dreams also required interpretation. See, e.g., Betz, *Offenbarung*, 77–8; Silberman, “Riddle,” 332–5; Finkel, “Pesher,” 357–70; Collins, “Prophecy and Fulfillment,” 303; Berrin, “Pesharim,” 123–6.

ancient prophecy and is essential to understanding the earlier revelation correctly. Moreover, by portraying the exegesis of the Teacher as the fulfillment of Hab 2:2, the pesherist asserts that his scriptural interpretation itself represents the realization of the purposes of God.¹⁰⁷ The description of the exegesis of the Teacher in 1QpHab 7:1–5 thus serves to highlight the legitimacy of his scriptural interpretation from a number of different vantage points.¹⁰⁸

Besides validating the exegesis of the Teacher of Righteousness, the descriptions of his interpretive activities also serve to define the boundaries of the community he represents. 1QpHab indicates that acceptance to or exclusion from the community occurs on the basis of one's response to the message of the Teacher and his predictions about the final age. For example, 1QpHab 2:1–10 identifies three groups of "traitors" (בוגדים) who reject or become unfaithful to the message of the Teacher (1QpHab 2:1–2, 3–4, 6).¹⁰⁹ Silberman suggests that these three groups of "traitors" correspond to three periods in the history of the community.¹¹⁰ If so, the pesher defines three stages of community formation in which people were delineated as outsiders to the group on the basis of their rejection of the scriptural interpretation of the

¹⁰⁷ The verb "may run" (ירון) in 1QpHab 7:3 was the work of a different hand, even though this verb occurs in the citation of Hab 2:2 in 1QpHab 6:15. As Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 111, notes, the addition changes the sense of למען from "for the sake of" to "in order that." The meaning of ירון in 1QpHab 7:3 also presents an interpretive challenge. Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 108, notes that ירון has often been read in the lemma (1QpHab 6:16; cf. Hab 2:2) as a reference to reading or interpreting quickly, but argues that the term refers to the running of a prophetic emissary who carries God's message to others (e.g., 2 Sam 18:21–26; Jer 23:21). He suggests that 1 QpHab 7:3 indicates that the Teacher of Righteousness performs an interpretive task that resembles that of a prophetic messenger; he reads the message of God and, through his interpretation, carries it to others. Silberman, "Riddle," 344–5, suggests the meaning "to shatter," (figuratively "to interpret") since b. Sanhedrin 34a likens the shattering of a rock in Jer 23:29 to biblical interpretation. In Jer 23:29, the verb used is פוץ but Silberman maintains that the same meaning has been applied to ירון. Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 111, suggests that the term ירון may be intended as a word-play on the term "mystery" (רו); the Teacher of Righteousness provides interpretations that divulge the mysterious meanings of the words of the prophets.

¹⁰⁸ The use of the definite article with the participle הקורא in 1QpHab 6:16 and 7:3 may further underscore the privileged status of the Teacher by presenting him as the one and only interpreter of prophecy. Compare קורא in the MT of Hab 2:2.

¹⁰⁹ See Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 31–2; Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 54–6; Horgan, *Pesharim*, 23–4.

¹¹⁰ Silberman, "Riddle," 336: "The first group belongs to the days of the *Moreh ha-Zedek*; the second, to the period after the new covenant was entered into; the third, to the *future traitors*" (336); cf. Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 54–6; Horgan, *Pesharim*, 24.

Teacher of Righteousness. By contrast, the pesherist characterizes the in-group by describing their fidelity to the scriptural interpretations of the Teacher: these “men of truth” observe the Law and “will not desert the service of truth” even when the final age seems to delay in coming (1QpHab 7:10–12).¹¹¹

George Brooke suggests that Pesher Habakkuk may have had a further role in defining the Qumran community. Since the Jewish scriptures were a common basis of authority for many Jews, Brooke suggests that “the pesharim . . . could have been used to encourage identification with the community and its supposed scripturally ordained history and circumstances.” He argues that “divinely inspired exegesis” could have had a role in “convincing the potential convert of the heavenly origin of the religious view of the world” that the community espoused.¹¹² The scriptural interpretation of the Teacher provided a foundation for community members who could identify with the Jewish scriptures as a source of authority and understand their participation in the community as part of their final fulfillment. In addition to demonstrating the divine origin of the scriptural interpretation of the Teacher of Righteousness, then, the author of Pesher Habakkuk uses his exegesis to define the boundaries of the community and to provide scriptural warrant for its existence.

1.4.2.2 *The Hodayot (1QH^a)*

Although the *Hodayot* contain what appear to be two independent literary units—the hymns of the Teacher (1QH^a 10–17) and the hymns of the community (1QH^a 4–9; 11:3–18; 15:29–36; 15:37–16:4; 18–26)—both parts of this composition frequently refer to the divine revelation that God bestowed upon the community.¹¹³ The hymns of the Teacher portray

¹¹¹ Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 226, also notes that the wider context of Pesher Habakkuk outlines two main opponents of the Teacher: the Man of the Lie (e.g., 1QpHab 2:1–2; 5:8–12) and the Wicked Priest (e.g., 1QpHab 11:6–8; 4QpPsa 1–10.iv.8). The Wicked Priest pursued and persecuted the Teacher whereas the Man of Lies seems to have disputed with him over religious interpretation and law.

¹¹² Brooke, “Justifying Deviance,” 80–4, at 84.

¹¹³ Some earlier scholars attributed the entire composition of the *Hodayot* to the Teacher of Righteousness. See, especially, E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1955), 39. By contrast, Svend Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (ATDan 2; Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960), 316, argued that the hymns were not a literary unity. G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963) and J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes: Heils—und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und in Neuen Testament*

- 12:10 כצפור מקנה וכול רעי ומודעי נדחו ממני ויחשבוני לכלי אובד
והמה מליצי
- 12:11 כזב וחוזי רמיה זממו עלי {כז} בליעל להמיר תורתכה אשר שננתה
בלבבי בחלקות
- 12:12 לעמכה ויעצורו משקה דעת מצמאים ולצמאם ישקום חומץ למע
הבט אל
- 12:13 תעותם להתהולל במועדיה^ה להתפש במצודותם כי אתה אל תנאץ
כל מחשבת
- 12:14 בליעל ועצתכה היא תקום ומחשבת לבכה תכון לנצח והמה
נעלמים זמות בליעל
- 12:15 יחשובו וידרשוכה בלב ולב ולא נכוננו באמתכה שורש פורה רוש
ולענה במחשבותם
- 12:16 ועם שרירות לבם יתורו וידרשוכה בגלולים ומכשול עוונם שמו
לנגד פניהם ויבאו
- 12:17 לדורשכה מפי נביאי כזב מפותי תעות והם [ב]^ל[ו]עג שפה ולשון
אחרת ידברו לעמד
- 12:18 להולל ברמיה כול מעשיהם כי לא בחרו בדרך [לב] כה ולא האזינו
לדברכה כי אמרו
- 12:19 לחזון דעת לא נכון ולדרך לבכה לא היאה כי אתה אל תענה להם
לשופטם
- 12:20 בגבורתכה^ה [כ] גלוליהם וכרוב פשעיהם למען יתפשו במחשבותם
אשר נזורו מבריתכה
- 12:21 ותכרת במ^ה[שפ]ט כול אנשי מרמה וחוזי תעות לא ימצאו עוד כי
אין הולל בכול מעשיך
- 12:22 ולא רמיה במזמת לבכה ואשר כנפשכה יעמודו לפניכה לעד
והולכי בדרך לבכה
- 12:23 יכוננו לנצח^ה[ו]אני בתומכי בכה אתעודדה ואקומה על מנאצי וידי
על כול בוזי כיא
- 12:24 לא יחשובו^ה [י]עד הגבירכה בי ותופע לי בכוחכה לאורתים ולא
טחתה בבושת פני
- 12:25 כול הנדרש^ה[י]ם לי הנועדים^ה לבריתכה וישומעוני ההולכים בדרך
לבכה ויערוכו לכה
- 12:26 בסוד קדושים ותוצא לנצח משפטם ולמישרים אמת ולא תתעם
ביד חלכאים
- 12:27 כזומם למו ותתן מוראם על עמכה ומפץ לכול עמי הארצות להכרית
במשפט כול
- 12:28 עוברי פיה ובי האירותה פני רבים ותגבר עד לאין מספר כי
הודעתני ברזי
- 12:29 פלאכה ובסוד פלאכה הגברתה עמדי והפלא לנגד רבים בעבור
כבודכה ולהודיע
- 1230:a לכול החיים גבורותיכה
- 12:6 [] *vacat* I thank you, Lord, because you have enlightened my face
for your covenant and *m*[]
- 12:7 [] I seek you. As perfect dawn you reveal yourself to me with
early [li]ght.
But they, your people []

- 12:8 in [their]stra[y]ing, and] they used slippery words on them. Mediators of deceit misdirected them and they come to ruin without perceiving, for []
- 12:9 in delusion their deeds because I have been rejected by them. And they do not esteem me when you show your strength through me; for they drive me from my land
- 12:10 like a bird from its nest. All my friends and my acquaintances are driven from me, and regard me as a broken jug. But they are mediators of
- 12:11 falsehood and seers of deceit. They have plotted devilry against me to exchange your Law, which you engraved in my heart, for flattering teachings
- 12:12 for your people. They withhold the drink of knowledge from the thirsty, and for their thirst they give them vinegar to drink, so that they look upon
- 12:13 their mistake, acting like fools in their feasts, catching themselves in their nets.
But you, O God, despise every devilish plan
- 12:14 and your counsel will remain, and the plan of your heart will be established forever. But they, hypocrites, plot devilish plans,
- 12:15 they seek you with a double heart and are not steadfast in your truth. A root which produces poison and bitterness is in their thoughts,
- 12:16 and with stubbornness of heart they inquire, and they search for you among idols.
They have placed before themselves the stumbling-block of their iniquity, and they go
- 12:17 to inquire of you by the mouth of lying prophets who are deceived by error.
They speak to your people [with] m[o]cking lips and a weird tongue
- 12:18 deceitfully ridiculing all their deeds. For they have not chosen the pa[th of] your [heart] nor have they listened to your word. For they say
- 12:19 of the vision of knowledge, 'It is not certain', and of the path of your heart, 'It is not that'. But you, O God, will answer them, judging them
- 12:20 with your power [according to] their idols and the abundance of their transgressions, so that those who deviate from your covenant will be caught in their plans.
- 12:21 You will cut off in ju[dgm]ent all people of deceit, and seers of error will no longer be found. For there is no delusion in all your works,
- 12:22 and there is no deceit in the plan of your heart. Those who are in harmony with you will stand before you forever, and those who walk in the way of your heart

- 12:23 will be established forever. [And], as for me, when I hold fast to you, I remain resolute and rise up against those who scorn me, and my hand is against all those who despise me, for
- 12:24 they have no respect for [me], as long as you show your strength through me and appear to me in your strength like early light. You have not covered in disgrace the faces of
- 12:25 all those who have been examined by me, who have gathered together for your covenant.
Those who walk on the way of your heart listen to me, and they marshal themselves before you
- 12:26 in the council of the holy ones. You bring forth justice successfully and truth with ease. You do not let them be misled by the hand of the vile
- 12:27 when they scheme against them; instead you put fear of them upon your people and (bring) destruction to all the peoples of the lands, to cut off in judgment all
- 12:28 who transgress your word. Through me you have enlightened the faces of many, and you have increased them beyond number. For you have caused me to know your wondrous
- 12:29 mysteries, and by your wondrous counsel you have strengthened my position and done wonders before many for the sake of your glory, and in order to make known
- 12:30a your powerful acts to all the living.
(1QH^a 12:6–30a)

The passage presents the privileged knowledge of the Teacher as the key to understanding the scriptures and the will of God.¹¹⁷ 1QH^a 12:6–11 announces that God has enlightened the Teacher by his covenant (1QH^a 12:6 לְבִרִיתִכָּה; cf. 12:25).¹¹⁸ He portrays himself as a privileged recipient of divine knowledge: God has enlightened his face (1QH^a 12:6), appeared to him (1QH^a 12:7 הוֹפֵעָה לִּי; cf. 12:24 וְתוֹפֵעַ לִּי),¹¹⁹ and

¹¹⁷ Commenting on this hymn, Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 311–2, suggests that it refers to “rival claims to knowledge of the torah” (312), and that the Qumran community created an “ideology of truth” in which they privileged a certain “knowledge of God’s will as the key to reality” (311).

¹¹⁸ Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 268, translates this phrase “by your covenant.” Julie A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* (STDJ 59; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 106–7, suggests that 1QH^a 12:6 draws a parallel between the experience of the speaker and the illumination of the face of Moses when he received the Law on Sinai and therefore argues that “the theme of the poem is declared to be interpretation of Torah” (106–7).

¹¹⁹ The *Hodayot* use the verbal roots גָּלָה and יָפַע to describe revelatory experiences (גָּלָה in 1QH^a 5:8–9; 9:21; 19:17; 20:32–34; יָפַע in 1QH^a 12:7, 24; 17:31; 23:5–7). This parallels language of revelation found in the Hebrew Bible. See Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 368.

caused him to know wondrous mysteries (1QH^a 12:28–29 הודעתני ברזי (פלאכה).¹²⁰ These descriptions of the divine knowledge of the Teacher correspond to and legitimate his status as an inspired interpreter of Mosaic law. Through his access to divine revelation, he becomes illuminated for the covenant (1QH^a 12:6), and God engraves the Torah in his heart (1QH^a 12:11).¹²¹

The revelation that the Teacher possesses also serves to define his community over against other Jews. The divine revelation that he provides enables those who listen to him to align themselves with God (1QH^a 12:25), gain access to eschatological salvation (1QH^a 12:26),¹²² and receive illumination (1QH^a 12:28; ובי האירותה פני רבים). The identity of the community thus rests upon their reception of the revelation of the Teacher. By contrast, other Jews fail to receive this knowledge because they look for it in the wrong place. They listen to mediators of deceit and fraud (1QH^a 12:8 מליצי רמיה; 12:10–11 מליצי כזב; cf. 10:31)¹²³ who search for divine revelation through illegitimate means

¹²⁰ For other descriptions of the “wonders,” “wondrous mysteries,” and the mystery of wisdom that the Teacher possesses, see, e.g., 1QH^a 9:21; 15:26–27; 18:14–15; 19:4, 10, 28; 20:11–13, 20.

¹²¹ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 285, 368. For references to knowledge of and obedience to the Law elsewhere in the *Hodayot*, see, e.g., 1QH^a 6:10–15; 8:1–10; 10:28; 18:30. See also Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 69–70; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 287.

¹²² Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 321–2, argues that the *Hodayot* present the teaching and revelation of the Teacher as eschatological salvation, and describe this salvation as fellowship with the “holy ones.” Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 127, suggests that the phrase בסוד קודשים in 1QH^a 12:26 may refer to angels. Compare צבא קודשים in 1QH^a 11:22. See also the description of the community in 1QH^a 14:13–14 and 19:12–14. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 297, similarly argues that the hymns present the elect as recipients of eschatological salvation because of their acceptance of the revelation of God. According to Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliern von Qumran* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 44–64, 78–88, the community saw its existence as a beginning stage of the end of time. In the intermediary time period, the faithful enjoyed the privilege of communion with the angels. See also G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (HTS 56; Cambridge: HUP, 2006), 188–93. Émile Puech, “Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and in the New Testament,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (CJAS 10; The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls; ed. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 250–1, concurs but emphasizes that the Qumran community regards itself as but a first step to a final end that will include a complete destruction and renewal.

¹²³ The term מליץ derives from the root לִיץ in the Hebrew Bible and means “to interpret” or “to intercede” in the *hiphil* form. The *hiphil* participle מליץ is used four times in the Hebrew Bible (Gen 42:23; Isa 43:27; 2 Chron 32:31; Job 33:23) and means “interpreter,” or “mediator.” Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 35, suggests that מליץ in the

(1QH^a 12:14b-18a),¹²⁴ reject the “vision of knowledge” of the Teacher (1QH^a 12:19), and withhold from people the “drink of knowledge” (1QH^a 12:12). The passage further describes the deluded condition of the opponents of the Teacher by indicating that they produce illegitimate interpretations of the scriptures that pervert his divinely inspired exegesis (1QH^a 12:11).¹²⁵ These contrasting descriptions both show the superiority of the scriptural interpretation of the Teacher over that of rival leaders and serve to define the boundaries of his community with reference to this activity.¹²⁶ Those who receive the revelation and Torah interpretation of the Teacher become part of the end-time elect community whereas those who listen to his rivals remain deceived.

Hodayot refers to an intermediary of either truth or error. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 107, uses the more neutral term “spokesmen” to translate מליץ. Michael C. Douglas, “Power and Praise in the Hodayot: A Literary Critical Study of 1QH 9:1–18:4,” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1998), 264, takes the term to mean “mediator” and argues that it refers to someone with an official role as teacher of the Torah.

¹²⁴ As Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 287, notes, the repetition of term דרש describes the attempts of the opponents to gain access to divine revelation (1QH^a 12:14, 15, 16). They seek God with a double heart (1QH^a 12:14), among idols (1QH^a 12:15), and through false prophets (1QH^a 12:16).

¹²⁵ They exchange the Torah which God has engraved on his heart “for flattering teachings” (בחלקות). In 1QH^a 10:15, 31, the expression “flattering teachings” or “smooth things” (חלקות) occurs with the phrase “seekers of smooth things” (דורשי חלקות) and is used as a label that depicts those who propagate deceit (cf. CD 1:18; 4Q169 23 iii 10; 4Q169 3–4 i 2, 7; 3–4 ii 2, 4; 2–4 iii 3, 7). A number of scholars suggest that the expression “smooth things” (חלקות) represents a pun on הלכות, a term that refers to the legal enactment of the Pharisees. See Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law* (SJLA 24; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977), 32, n. 78; Albert Baumgarten, “The Name of the Pharisees,” *JBL* 102 (1983): 420–2; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 284–5; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 250; idem “The Pharisees and their Legal Traditions According to the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 8 (2001): 266, 277; James C. VanderKam, “Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral Law,” in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (VTSup 94; ed. S. M. Paul, R. A. Kraft, and L. H. Schiffman; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 466. Others maintain that the הלכות need not be taken as a description of Pharisaic interpretive activities and therefore argue that דורשי חלקות may not refer to the Pharisees. See, e.g., John P. Meier, “Is There *Halaka* (the Noun) at Qumran,” *JBL* 75 (1956): 92; Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 308–9.

¹²⁶ Similarly, in 1QH^a 10:3–19, the hymnist describes himself as a mediator of knowledge of wondrous mysteries (1QH^a 10:13 פלא ברזי דעת מליץ) who provides a foundation of truth and knowledge (1QH^a 10:10), and becomes an open source of knowledge for all who understand (1QH^a 10:18). By contrast, he depicts his opponents as “mediators of error” (מליצי תעית) and “men of deceit” (אנשי רמיה) who oppress the hymnist. As Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 309–10, notes, 1QH^a 10:13–16 creates a series of binary opposites that show the outsiders of the community to be opponents of both the Teacher and his followers. The contrast therefore simultaneously reinforces the authoritative status of the Teacher and creates boundaries for the community.

The hymns of the community also portray divinely granted knowledge as a privilege of the entire community (e.g., 1QH^a 6:8–9, 12–13; 18:27–28; 19:12–17, 27–28; 20:13–14), and reinforce the elect status of the Qumran group by indicating that other humans cannot comprehend God apart from receiving this exclusive gift of knowledge (1QH^a 5:19–21; 18:2–9; 20:19, 33–34; 21:4–5). Although the community hymns do not explicitly identify the Jewish scriptures as the content of this knowledge, allusions to scripture permeate the *Hodayot* to such an extent that they have been described as a “mosaic of the Scriptures.”¹²⁷ 1QH^a 7:25–26 provides a particularly apt example of this type of intertextuality since it uses a scriptural allusion to reinforce the view that the community possesses a privileged ability to understand the will of God.¹²⁸

7:25b ואני ידעתי בביתך כיאלא ביד בשר [יוכל להתם] אדם
7:26a דרכו ולא יוכל אנוש להכין צעדו

7:25b But I know, by means of the understanding that comes from you, that it is not through the power of the flesh that an individual [is able to perfect]

7:26a his way nor is a person able to direct his steps.
(1QH^a 7:25–26)

Compare this allusion with the scriptural passage itself:

ידעתי יהוה כי לא לאדם דרכו לא־לאיש הלך והכין את־צעדו

I know, O LORD, that the way of a person does not belong to him, nor does it belong to a person, as he walks, to direct his steps.
(Jer 10:23)

The hymnist alludes to Jer 10:23 but supplements this prophetic text with the confession that he possesses knowledge from God (בביתך).¹²⁹ As a result, he applies Jer 10:23 to himself and, by implication, the

¹²⁷ Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 301–51, at 320. The process of identifying scriptural allusions therefore becomes difficult and elusive, as Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 42–55, points out. Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 213, suggests that the use of intertextual allusions to scripture in the *Hodayot* is so immense that it “exceeds every attempt to organize and classify it”; cf. Bonnie Kittel, “The Problems of Biblical Language,” *The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary* (SBLDS 50; Missoula: Scholars, 1981), 48–55.

¹²⁸ My citations of Jer 10:23 and 1QH^a 7:25–26 here follow Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 213. For further discussion of this scriptural allusion, see Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 71–2; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 230.

¹²⁹ See also the similar expressions ידעתי מבינתך in 1QH^a 6:12 and ידעתי מבינתכה in 9:19.

members of the community in an unusual way:¹³⁰ although humans normally cannot direct their steps, the members of the community have received understanding from God that enables them to discern what others do not. Accordingly, Jer 10:23 serves to support the claim that God had destined the Qumran group to become the exclusive recipients of divine knowledge.

Newsom argues that the application of Jer 10:23 to the circumstances of the community resembles the relationship created between the original prophetic message and inspired interpretation in the pesharim.¹³¹ Furthermore, she suggests that the hymnist veils the reference to Jer 10:23 so that only the discerning reader would recognize the allusion; that is, the hymnist “rewards the increasingly proficient reader with the evidence that he is indeed one who knows.”¹³² Similarly, Maxine Grossman argues that “from a sectarian perspective, the ability to understand a text—to *really know* what it is saying—would separate a sectarian from an outsider, and a higher-ranking sectarian from a new volunteer.”¹³³ In this sense, the allusion to and exegesis of Jer 10:23 in 1QH^a 7:15–16b serve to divide insiders from outsiders, as well as to distinguish between initiates and higher-ranking members of the community.

Although references to the Jewish scriptures in the *Hodayot* are rarely overt, 1QH^a 7:15–16 and 12:6–30 demonstrate that both the community and its Teacher were steeped in scriptural traditions. Moreover, even as the descriptions of the divine revelatory experiences of the Teacher support his claim to possess a privileged understanding of the Torah, so the interpretation of Jer 10:23 validates the community’s claim to possess a revelatory understanding of the will of God. Descriptions of divine revelation and scriptural interpretation in the *Hodayot* thus become mutually supportive. Together, these passages articulate the self-understanding of the members of the community: they represent the group that possesses a privileged knowledge of the Jewish scriptures and the will of God over against others who do not.

¹³⁰ Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 71.

¹³¹ Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 213–4.

¹³² Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 214; cf. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 54.

¹³³ Grossman, “Cultivating Identity,” 4–10, explores a similar use of scripture in the Damascus Document; cf. Christopher D. Stanley, “The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method,” in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (JSNTSup 148; ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders; Sheffield: SAP, 1997), 44–58.

1.4.2.3 CD and IQS

The description of scriptural interpretation in the *Damascus Document* (CD) also closely links exegetical activity with the origins of the community that it represents. Although the provenance and dating of CD are widely disputed, most scholars agree that the group responsible for its composition has strong links with the Qumran community.¹³⁴ Regardless of the precise identity of the group behind the text, it provides us with another example of how depictions of inspired scriptural interpretation could influence the development of the self-understanding of a Second Temple Jewish community.¹³⁵

In the section of the *Damascus Document* known as the Admonition (CD 2:14–6:11a), the covenanters twice associate the emergence of their community with Torah interpretation. In the first passage, CD 2:14–3:17, the speaker exhorts his audience to listen to him and announces that he will open their eyes so that they can see and understand the works of God (CD 2:14–15). He then proceeds with an account of world history that describes the failure of humanity to follow God (CD 2:17–3:1). Within this narrative, CD 3:2–3 presents Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as exceptional individuals who remain faithful to God's pre-

¹³⁴ Some suggest that the text describes the origins of the Qumran community; see, e.g., F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran Modern Biblical Studies* (Garden City: Anchor Books, 1961), 81–2; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 90–4; Geza Vermes, “The History of the Essenes,” in *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 58–9; Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (CCWJCW 2; Cambridge: CUP, 1987), 7. Others suggest that CD was composed within the context of a parent, or related, community. See, e.g., Milik, *Discovery*, 87–93; H. Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Bonn, 1971); J. A. Fitzmyer, “Prolegomenon,” in Solomon Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work: Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, vol. 1 (New York: Ktav, 1970), 16.

¹³⁵ Maxine L. Grossman, *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study* (STDJ 45; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 37–40, takes a “new historiographical” approach to CD in which she attends to the development of the history and ideology of the covenant community over time, rather than focusing upon the events “behind the text” (39). This involves studying “ideological constructions rather than historical events” (39) and evokes a different set of questions that include the following: “what the covenanters thought about their own history, how they understood their role in the world and their own communal identity, and how their understanding of their texts may have changed over time” (40). For a similar perspective, see, e.g., Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the Damascus Document* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: SAP, 1983), 1–47; Albert Baumgarten, “The Perception of the Past in the Damascus Document,” in *The Damascus Document, A Centennial Discovery: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*, 4–8 February, 1998 (STDJ 34; ed. Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick; Boston: Brill, 2000), 1–15.

cepts and covenant. They stand in contrast to the rest of Israel who reject God's covenant and therefore experience exile to Babylon (CD 3:4–11). Immediately following this scathing account of Israel's past infidelity, the text identifies a remnant that "remained steadfast in God's precepts," in continuity with the patriarchs before them:

- ובמחזיקים במצות אל
 3:12b אשר נותרו מהם הקים אל את בריתו לישראל עד עולם לגלות
 3:13 להם נסתרות אשר תעו במ כל ישראל vacat שבתות קדשו ומועדי
 3:14 כבודו עידות צדקו ודרכי אמתו וחפצי רצונו אשר יעשה
 3:15 האדם וחיה בהם vacat פתח לפניהם ויחפרו באר למים רבים
 3:16 ומואסיהם לא יחיה
 3:17a
 3:12b But with the ones who remained steadfast in precepts of God,
 3:13 who were left from them, God established his covenant with
 Israel forever, to reveal
 3:14 to them the hidden matters in which all Israel erred, his holy
 sabbaths and
 3:15 his glorious feasts,¹³⁶ the testimonies of his righteous, and the
 ways of his truth, and the desires of his will which
 3:16 a person must do in order to live by them. vacat He opened
 before them (the hidden matters) and they dug a well of much
 water;
 3:17a and whoever rejects them shall not live.
 (CD 3:12b–17a)

By portraying the establishment of the community as a type of post-exilic restoration, CD 2:14–3:17 shows the emergence of a faithful remnant to be a climax in the history of Israel.¹³⁷ The passage also highlights the exclusivity of this restoration; like the patriarchs, the remnant remains steadfast in the precepts of God over against the rest of Israel.¹³⁸ Accordingly, they alone become the true heirs of the patriarchs and the proper continuation of Israel.¹³⁹ Moreover, an intrinsic part of their liberation from exile relates to their reception of a special revelation

¹³⁶ The references to "holy sabbaths" and "glorious feasts" suggests that the "hidden matters" relate to knowledge of calendrical cycles. See Grossman, *Reading for History*, 81; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 34.

¹³⁷ Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 33; Grossman, *Reading for History*, 118.

¹³⁸ Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 34.

¹³⁹ Davies, "'Old' and 'New' Israel," 33–7, suggests that CD 3:13–14 (cf. CD 1:4) describes the end of "old" Israel and the emergence of "new" Israel. He notes the double use of Israel in this passage: the term refers to the community through which God's covenant becomes re-established (3:13–14) and to those who continue to err (3:14). Nevertheless, as Davies notes, the new group claims to receive divine revelation and a new founder so that it becomes "not so much an Israel *recovered* as an Israel

of the “hidden matters” (נסתרות) that enable them to interpret Torah correctly.¹⁴⁰ Through the claim to have received this gift of knowledge, the covenanters validate their scriptural interpretation and link their elect identity to revelatory insight.¹⁴¹

Another passage in the Admonition, CD 5:15b–6:11a, recounts essentially the same story as CD 2:14–3:17 and again emphasizes the central role that revelatory knowledge and Torah interpretation play in the genesis of the community. Here, as in CD 2:14–3:17, the text contrasts the Damascus community with the rest of Israel, and uses the metaphor of a well to describe the emergence of the chosen group:

5:15b כי אם למילפנים פקד
 5:16 אל את מעשיהם ויחר אפו בעלילותיהם כי לא עם בינות הוא
 5:17 הם גוי אבד עצות מאשר אין בהם בינה כי מלפנים עמד
 5:18 משה ואהרן ביד שר האורים ויקם בליעל את יחנה ואת
 5:19 אחיהו במזמתו בהושע ישראל את הראשונה vacat
 5:20 vacat ובקץ חרבן הארץ עמדו מסיגי הגבול ויתעו את ישראל
 5:21 ותישם הארץ כי דברו סרה על מצות אל ביד משה וגם
 6:1 במשיחו (במשיחי) הקודש וינבאו שקר להשיב את ישראל מאחר
 6:2 אל ויזכר אל ברית ראשנים vacat ויקם מאהרן נבונים ומישראל
 6:3 חכמים וישמיעם ויחפורו את הבאר באר חפרוה שרים כרוה
 6:4 נדיבי העם במחוקק הבאר היא התורה וחופריה vacat הם
 6:5 שבי ישראל היוצאים מארץ יהודה ויגורו בארץ דמשק
 6:6 אשר קרא אל את כולם שרים כי דרשוהו ולא הושבה
 6:7 פארתם בפי אחד vacat והמחוקק הוא דורש התורה אשר
 6:8 אמר ישעיה מוציא כלי למעשיהו vacat ונדיבי העם הם
 6:9 הבאים לכרות את הבאר במחוקקות אשר חקק המחוקק
 6:10 להתהלך במה בכל קץ הרשיע וזולתם לא ישיגו עד עמד
 6:11a יורה הצדק באחרית הימים

reborn” (33). Davies argues that CD 7:10–21 implies that Jews outside the Damascus community stand in continuity with the “old” Israel who rejected the laws of God.

¹⁴⁰ As Jonathan G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8*, 19–20 (BZAW 228; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), 77, points out, לגלות להם in CD 3:13b–14 alludes to Deut 29:28 but transforms the meaning of the biblical phrase. Deut 29:28 indicates that “the secret things (נסתרות) belong to the LORD our God” and that “the revealed things” (נגלות) belong to Israel. By way of comparison, CD 3:13b–14 asserts that God has given the hidden things (לגלות להם) (נסתרות) to the covenanters as an exclusive gift; cf. Shemesh and Werman, “Hidden Things,” 418–9.

¹⁴¹ Shemesh and Werman, “Hidden Things,” 418–9, rightly argue that the divine revelation given to the community also involves their active participation in the study of Torah. CD 3:16 refers both to God’s disclosure of revelation *and* to the digging of a well of water, the latter of which symbolizes Torah study and interpretation (cf. CD 6:3–9). See also Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 35.

- 5:15b For in ancient times
 5:16 God visited their deeds and his anger burned against their works, for it is not a people of discernment.
 5:17 They are a nation bereft of counsel; in them there is no discernment. For in ancient times there arose
 5:18 Moses and Aaron, by the hand of the prince of lights, and Belial, in his cunning, raised up Jannes and
 5:19 his brother during the first deliverance of Israel. *vacat*
 5:20 *vacat* And in the time of desolation of the land there arose those who displaced the boundary and caused Israel to err.
 5:21 And the land became desolate, because they spoke of rebellion against the commandments of God (which he gave) by the hand of Moses and also
 6:1 by his holy anointed ones. They prophesied deceit in order to cause Israel to turn from (following) after
 6:2 God. But God remembered the covenant of the forefathers. *vacat* And he raised up from Aaron those who understood and from Israel
 6:3 wise ones, and he caused them to listen. And they dug the well: *Num 21:18* "A well which the princes dug, which
 6:4 the nobles of the people delved with the sceptre." The well is the law. And those who dug it *vacat* they are
 6:5 the turning ones of Israel who went out from the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus,
 6:6 all of whom God called princes, because they sought him and their renown has not been repudiated
 6:7 in the mouth of anyone. *vacat* And the sceptre, he is the Interpreter of the Torah,¹⁴² of whom
 6:8 Isaiah said: *Isa 54:16* "bringing out a tool for his work." *vacat* And the nobles of the people, they are
 6:9 those who come to dig the well with the staves that the sceptre decreed,
 6:10 to walk in them throughout the whole time of wickedness, and without which they will not obtain it, until there arises
 6:11a one who teaches righteousness at the end of days.¹⁴³
 (CD 5:15b–6:11a)

¹⁴² In Num 21:18, the term *מחקק* refers to a sceptre but here is used to represent the "Interpreter of the Torah." For the post-biblical use of *מחקק* to denote scribal authority and interpretive skills, see Fraade, "Interpretive Authority," 60, n. 46. As Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 50, notes, *מחקק* derives from the verbal root *חקק* which means "to decree" or "to prescribe." The term "staves" (*מחוקקות*), which depicts the means by which subsequent community members "dig the well," also plays on this meaning of *חקק*.

¹⁴³ Although Davies, *Damascus Document*, 124, argues that "one who teaches righteousness" (*יורה הצדק*) refers to the Teacher of Righteousness who returns in the eschatological age, Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 193, opines that this figure should be identified as the eschatological prophet. The phrase *יורה הצדק* in this passage is

The passage explains that Israel's lack of understanding provokes the wrath of God against them (CD 5:16–17).¹⁴⁴ In their gullibility, they follow leaders who prophesy deceitfully and incite rebellion against the precepts of Moses and the prophets (CD 5:21–6:1). To remedy the lack of perception that led to the Babylonian exile and desolation of the land, God raises up men of wisdom and understanding who, with the assistance of the “Interpreter of the Torah,”¹⁴⁵ restore Israel through their scriptural interpretation (cf. CD 6:14).¹⁴⁶ The founders of the Damascus community thus stand in direct contrast to those who formerly deceived Israel, as the repeated use of **שוב** and *hiphil* verbal forms demonstrate: whereas the false prophets altered the covenant and so caused Israel to err (**ויתעו**) and to turn (**להשיב**) from following God, God causes the covenanters to listen (**וישמיעם**) so that they become the “turning ones of Israel” (**ישראל שבי**) who interpret the scriptures correctly.¹⁴⁷ In this way, the passage presents “proper covenantal knowledge” as the key to redemption,¹⁴⁸ and relates this knowledge to the exegetical activity of the elect community, which represents renewed Israel.

The Community Rule (1QS), a text that outlines the way of life and beliefs of the Qumran community, also presents the proper interpre-

similar but not identical to **מורה צדק**, a phrase that elsewhere refers to the “Teacher of Righteousness” (e.g., CD 1:11; 20:32).

¹⁴⁴ As Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 46, notes, the phrase **עם בינות** in CD 5:16 alludes to Isa 27:11 and the phrase **הם גוי אבד עצות מאשר אין בהם בינה** in CD 5:17 alludes to Deut 32:28 to characterize former Israel as a people who do not understand God.

¹⁴⁵ Most scholars conclude that the “Interpreter of the Torah” in CD 6:7 represents the Teacher of Righteousness. See, e.g., Jeremias, *Lehrer*, 272; John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 148; idem, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 147; Fishbane, “From Scribalism to Rabbinism,” 453. Davies, *Damascus Document*, 119–25, suggests instead that the “Interpreter of the Torah” refers to an earlier leader of the community, perhaps its founder; cf. Fraade, “Interpretive Authority,” 62.

¹⁴⁶ Fishbane, “From Scribalism to Rabbinism,” 453, rightly notes that the well in this passage represents the interpretations of the Torah that God had opened up for the community. Fraade, “Interpretive Authority,” 61–2, explains that the text portrays the Interpreter as the instrument with which the community opens the Torah. According to Fraade, this suggests that the Interpreter prescribed the rules by which the community could open the well so that both the founders and later community members could “dig the well” (i.e., interpret the Torah; CD 6:3, 9) “according to the interpretation of the Torah” (**כפשר התורה**) that he had introduced (cf. CD 4:8; 6:14).

¹⁴⁷ As Grossman, *Reading for History*, 181–2, explains, CD 6:1–11a portrays **שבי ישראל** as those who turn away from the sin of the rest of Israel and toward the will of God and correct Torah interpretation.

¹⁴⁸ Grossman, *Reading for History*, 124–6.

tation of the scriptures as a central identifying characteristic of the group. In the opening chapter of this text, we read that those who enter the community “refine their knowledge in the truth of God’s decrees” (1QS 1:12) and “establish a covenant before God in order to carry out all that he commanded” (1QS 1:16–17). These statements suggest that the community originated with the express purpose of acquiring knowledge about how to be faithful to the commands of God. 1QS 5:7b–11 further develops this theme by showing compliance with the correct interpretation of the Torah to be a prerequisite to entrance to the community:

- 5:7b כול הבא לעצת היחד
 5:8 יבוא בברית אל לעיני כול המתנדבים ויקם על נפשו בשבועת אסר לשוב אל תורת מושה ככול אשר צוה בכול לב ובכול נפש לכול הנגלה ממנה לבני צדוק הכוהנים שומרי הברית ודורשי רצונו ולרוב אנשי בריתם
 5:10 המתנדבים יחד לאמתו ולהתלך ברצונו ואשר יקים בברית על נפשו להבדל מכול אנשי העול ההולכים
 5:11 בדרך הרשעה כיא לוא החשבו בבריתו כיא לוא בקשו ולוא דרשהו בחוקוהי לדעת הנסתרות אשר תעו
 5:12 במ לאש <ש> מה והנגלות עשו ביד רמה לעלות אף למשפט ולנקום נקם באלות ברית לעשות במ {מ}שפטים
 5:13a גדולים לכלת עולם לאין שרית *vacat*
 5:7b Whoever enters the council of the Community
 5:8 will enter the covenant of God in the presence of all who freely volunteer.
 He shall swear with a binding vow to return to the Law of Moses, according to all that he commanded, with whole
 5:9 heart and whole soul, to all that has been revealed from it to the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and seek his will, and to the multitude of the people of their covenant
 5:10 who freely volunteer together for his truth and to walk according to his will. And he shall swear by the covenant to be separate from all the people of injustice who walk
 5:11 in the way of wickedness. For they are not reckoned in his covenant because they have neither inquired nor sought after him concerning his statutes in order to know the hidden matters in which they have erred;
 5:12 by their own fault. And the revealed matters they have treated with insolence.
 Therefore, wrath will rise up for judgment and to execute vengeance by the curses of the covenant, in order to perform on them great
 5:13a judgments for everlasting annihilation, leaving no remnant.
 (1QS 5:7b–13a)

The individual who wishes to enter the community must commit himself to return to the Torah by complying with the revelation that the priestly leadership and the community as a whole possesses.¹⁴⁹ This description both underscores the privileged knowledge of the entire group, and demonstrates the vital relationship between joining the community and gaining access to the correct interpretation of the scriptures (cf. 1QS 1:7–9; 8:14–16; 9:17–19). The passage presents this knowledge as a revelation (הנגלה) that the community obtains through the study of the Torah, on the one hand, but as something hidden (הנסתרות) from outsiders who do not search the decrees of God, on the other.¹⁵⁰ 1QS 5:7b–13 thus defines the elect status of the community in terms of its exclusive knowledge and capacity to interpret the Torah, and uses this description as the basis for contrasting them with other Jews.

1QS 8:11b–16a draws a similar link between the identity of the Qumran community and its collective interpretation of the scriptures, and describes this activity as the end-time realization of prophecy:

8:11b וכול דבר הנסתר מישראל ונמצאו לאיש
 8:12 הדורש אל יסתרהו מאלה מיראת רוח נסוגה vacat ובהיות אלה
 בייחוד בישראל
 8:13 בתכונים האלה יבדלו מתוך מושב הנשי (אנשי) העול ללכת למדבר
 לפנות שם את דרך הואהא
 8:14 כאשר כתוב במדבר פנו דרך **** ישרו בערבה מסלה לאלוהינו
 8:15 היאה מדרש התורה א[ש]ר צוה ביד מושה לעשות ככול הנגלה
 עת בעת
 8:16a וכאשר גלו הנביאים ברוח קודשו vacat

¹⁴⁹ As Fraade, "Interpretive Authority," 53, points out, 1QS 5:8–10 indicates that the new member commits himself to the divine revelation that has been disclosed to the priestly leaders as well as to the community as a whole. He argues that the passage portrays entrance to the community as tantamount to engaging in the study and practice of its "esoteric" Torah (cf. 1QS 6:13–15), and maintains that the correct knowledge and practice of the Torah were revealed to the entire community through their ongoing study and interpretation. Similarly, P. Wernberg-Moller, *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction* (STDJ 1; Leiden: Brill, 1957), 95, suggests that לכול הנגלה in 1QS 5:9 refers to the particular interpretations that are revealed to the community through their Torah study. See, also, 1QS 6:6–8, a passage that describes the responsibility of the entire community to study the Torah continually (cf. CD 13:2–3).

¹⁵⁰ In other words, what is hidden from outsiders is revealed exclusively to the community. See Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 24; cf. Wernberg-Moller, *Manual*, 95; Fishbane, "From Scribalism to Rabbinism," 449. As Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 334–6, notes, 1QS 5 envisions two forms of *nigleh*, one referring to the exclusive understanding of the community (5:8–9) and the other referring to the Torah itself which all Israel possesses (1QS 5:10–11). He argues that the key to understanding 1QS 5:8–11 lies in recognizing these two different uses of *nigleh*.

- 8:11b And every matter which has been hidden from Israel but which has been found out by
- 8:12 the Interpreter, he should not conceal from them out of fear of a spirit of desertion. And when these have become a community in Israel
- 8:13 according to these regulations they shall be separate from the midst of the dwelling of the people of sin to walk to the desert in order to prepare there his path.
- 8:14 As it is written (*Isa 40:3*) "In the desert, prepare the way of ****, make straight in the desert a highway for our God."
- 8:15 This is the study of the law wh[i]ch he commanded through the hand of Moses to do according to all that has been revealed from age to age
- 8:16a and according to what the prophets have revealed through his holy spirit.
(1QS 8:11b–16a)

Here the text shows the legitimacy of the exegesis of the Qumran community in at least three ways. First, by indicating that the knowledge of the Interpreter was hidden (הנסתר) from the rest of Israel, but disclosed to the community, 1QS 8:11 highlights that only the community possesses the knowledge necessary to interpret the scriptures. Second, the passage asserts the legitimacy of the ongoing interpretive activity of the group by portraying it as a continuation of the periodic revelation that began with Moses and the prophets.¹⁵¹ Third, by representing the scriptural interpretation of the entire community as the fulfillment of Isa 40:3, 1QS 8:14–15 gives their exegetical activity prophetic sanction and shows it to be the outcome of God's pre-ordained plan.¹⁵² The descriptions of the privileged knowledge and scriptural interpretation of the community thus serve to demonstrate the authoritative status of their exegetical activity and to present it as the essential key to the proper observance of the Torah.

Summary

This brief overview of some key texts from the Qumran literature draws attention to the various ways that the community attempted to demon-

¹⁵¹ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 334–9. Since in 1QS 9:13, the *Maskil* replaces the prophets as the recipient of periodic revelation, we can infer that the study of the law in 1QS 8:15 represents a continuation of the periodic revelatory activity of the prophets. Compare 1QS 9:13—"He (the *Maskil*) should fulfill the will of God in compliance with all revelation for every period; he should acquire all the wisdom that has been gained according to the periods"—with 1QS 8:15–16.

¹⁵² Shemesh and Werman, "Hidden Things," 421.

strate the authoritative status of its scriptural interpretation and to define itself with reference to this exegetical activity. Various claims to possess divine revelation or a special insight from God point up the legitimacy of the scriptural interpretation of the community and, in turn, function as a means of distinguishing between insiders and outsiders. Moreover, by linking the origins of the community to the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures, the group could provide scriptural justification for its existence. This description of their continuity with the Jewish scriptures was also closely linked with the argument that they possessed an end-time revelation of the correct meaning of the scriptures.

1.5 CONCLUSION

In the first part of this chapter, I offered a brief survey of texts that provide evidence of the emergence of inspired exegesis as a mode of revelation during the Second Temple period. In the second part, I explored how certain Jewish interpreters claimed to possess this inspired understanding of the Jewish scriptures and used such claims to present their groups as the elect of Israel over against other Jews. Although they were expressed in diverse ways, these self-defining strategies often included the following characteristics: 1) the description of a privileged knowledge or ability that enabled an interpreter or group to understand the scriptures correctly (e.g., Daniel; 1QpHab; 1QH^a; CD; 1QS); 2) the claim to possess direct continuity with the revelation of the ancient prophets or patriarchs (e.g., Daniel 9; 1QpHab 7; CD 2–3); 3) the presentation of this special knowledge as an eschatological gift and end-time fulfillment of the scriptures (1Enoch 85–90; 93; 1QH^a 12; 1QS 8); 4) the presentation of the origins of or entrance to the community as the adoption of this knowledge and correct scriptural interpretation (e.g., CD 5–6; 1QH^a 12–13; 1QS 5, 8;); and 5) the use of the claim to the correct understanding of the scriptures to differentiate between insiders and outsiders to the community, or to present the in-group as true Israel (e.g., Daniel 11–12; 1 Enoch 85–90; 93; 1QH^a 12; CD 2–3; 5–6). In these various ways, descriptions of authoritative exegesis provided early Jewish groups with a means of articulating community identity.

In the chapters that follow, I will explore the use of similar strategies in the writings of Luke and Justin. In Chapter Two, I will compare their attempts to demonstrate that Christ-believers possess an inspired ability to understand the Jewish scriptures and to use this claim to

define the boundaries of the Christ-believing community. Here I will also evaluate their respective configurations of the continuity between the revelation of ancient prophecy and the inspired exegesis of these sacred texts by Christ-believers. Subsequently, in Chapter Four, I will compare and contrast their depictions of the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers as an eschatological gift that fulfills scriptural promises, and consider how this type of description provides scriptural justification for their respective distinctions between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community. Finally, in Chapter Five, I will discuss the differing ways that Luke and Justin appropriate the Jewish scriptures as part of an attempt to present members of their group as the true heirs of the heritage and scriptures of Israel.

CHAPTER TWO

EXEGESIS AND COMMUNITY IDENTITY IN THE WRITINGS OF LUKE AND JUSTIN*

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Even as some early Jewish exegetes mapped the boundaries for their groups by asserting that they had access to special knowledge or a divine revelation of the true meaning of the Jewish scriptures, so the Jesus movement emerged as an early Palestinian Jewish sect that also laid claim to these sacred texts by asserting that it possessed an authoritative ability to interpret them. Over time, however, this group came to be comprised of both Jews and non-Jews. Despite this shift in ethnic composition, the community continued to present scriptural exegesis as the special province of Christ-believers. The writings of Luke and Justin Martyr serve as important examples of how this early Christian practice took form. As noted in the introduction, a number of studies have examined Justin's reinterpretation of the Jewish scriptures for the non-Jewish Christian church. Likewise, scholars of Luke-Acts frequently discuss Luke's use of the LXX as a means of presenting the events that he narrates as the fulfillment of ancient prophecy. Even more significant to my study, however, is their common attempt to appropriate the Jewish scriptures for Christ-believers by showing that they have a special authority to interpret them. Like a number of early Jewish authors, Luke and Justin present the exegesis of their group as divinely inspired revelation and use this type of claim to show that the Christ-believing community held a privileged status in relation to the Jewish scriptures.

In this chapter, I will first provide an analysis of this common self-defining strategy in the writings of Luke and Justin. To do so, I will

* Throughout Chapters 2–5, Greek citations of the New Testament are from the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament, fourth revised edition (Stuttgart: Biblia-Druck, 1998) and the Greek citations of Justin Martyr's writings are from Denis Minns and Paul Parvis, eds., *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies* (Oxford: OUP, 2009); Miraslov Marcovich, ed., *Dialogus cum Tryphone* (PTS 47; New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1997). English translations are my own, produced in consultation with the translations listed in the primary sources section of the bibliography.

compare the following aspects of their representations of scriptural interpretation: 1) their portrayal of the exegesis of Christ-believers as an outcome of a divine revelatory experience and of instruction from the risen Christ, and 2) their depiction of the connection between this inspired interpretation and entrance to the Christ-believing community. Subsequently, I will point out some of the differences between the way that Luke and Justin attempt to demonstrate the authoritative status of the exegesis of Christ-believers and consider the impact that these differences have upon their respective descriptions of the knowledge of the Christ-believing community.

Although scholars have long observed that the writings of Luke and Justin bear significant similarities, determining the precise genealogical relationship between their works remains elusive.¹ Consequently, I will not here attempt to determine the specific literary relationship between Luke and Justin. Instead, I will treat them as “independent theologians” who sometimes use parallel Jesus traditions but develop these sources in both similar and disparate ways.² Whereas their similarities may suggest that Luke and Justin were part of the same “theological movement,”³ the differences between them demonstrate that their viewpoints, and the issues that they address, are not wholly congruent.

¹ J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 53; C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–1998), 1:44; see further discussion of this issue in the introduction.

² Oskar Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (NovTSup 106; Leiden: Brill, 1987), 432.

³ Although Overbeck and O'Neill share the similar view that the writings of Luke and Justin arose out of the same second-century theological milieu, F. Overbeck, “Ueber das Verhältniss Justins des Martyrers zur Apg,” *ZWT* 15 (1872): 305–49, offers a more nuanced position than that of O'Neill. See also Niels Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christentum: Eine Interpretation der Einleitung zum Dialogue Justins* (Acta Theologica Danica IX; Copenhagen: Prostant Apud Munksgaard, 1966), 261–72. Similarly, Richard I. Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2006), 309–42, has more recently argued for a second-century date for Acts, in part, because this text exhibits some characteristics that resemble those found in second-century writings.

2.2 A COMMON EMPHASIS: SCRIPTURAL INTERPRETATION AND THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE

Scriptural interpretation plays a vital role in the writings of both Luke and Justin. Luke expresses this emphasis in two important ways. First, within his account, he frequently presents scriptural exegesis as an essential element of the proclamation of Jesus and Christ-believers. The inaugural sermons of Jesus, Peter, and Paul serve as particularly important examples of how Luke develops this theme because they function as paradigmatic scenes that exemplify what occurred on other occasions where the details are not included.⁴ As such, they demonstrate the central role that the scriptures play in the message of Christ and Christ-believers. In his first sermon, for example, Jesus reads and interprets Isa 61:1–2 and Isa 58:6b in a synagogue setting on the Sabbath (Luke 4:16–30). Here Luke also indicates that scriptural reading and teaching was customary for Jesus (Luke 4:16—κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτοῦ). That Luke presents exegesis as the focal point of such an inaugural event and as a normative practice of Jesus strongly suggests that he regarded scriptural interpretation as a central element of the message of Jesus.⁵

⁴ So M. Scheckenburger, *Ueber den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte: Zugleich eine Ergaenzung der neueren Commentare* (Bern: C. Fischer, 1841), 127–51; cf. e.g., Philippe H. Menoud, “Le Plan des Actes des Apôtres,” *NTS* 1 (1954): 47; Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986–1990), 2:164–6; I. Howard Marshall, “Luke’s Portrait of the Pauline Mission” in *The Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul’s Mission* (ed. Peter Bolt and Mark Thompson; Downers Grove: IVP, 2000), 99–113; David Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (WUNT 130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 99.

⁵ Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory & Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity* (ASNU 22; Livonia: Dove, 1961), 226, suggests that the synagogue sermon in Nazareth demonstrates the way in which “Jesus began to expound the Scriptures during the period of his earthly ministry” (226) and maintains that Luke 4:16–30 gives a programmatic and paradigmatic description of the work of Jesus. Several scholars also argue that Luke 4:16–20 serves as a “prototype” of preaching scenes in Acts. See, e.g., John Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke’s Gospel: A Study of Early Christian Historiography* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1976), 87; Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke* (trans. Geoffrey Buswell; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), 34–8; Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (HTKZNT; 2 vols.; Freiburg: Herder, 1982–1994), 1:238; Gerhard Lohfink, *Die Sammlung Israels: eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (SANT 39; München: Kösel-Verlag, 1975), 44–6; Robert C. Tannehill, “The Mission of Jesus According to Luke 4:16–30,” in *Jesus in Nazareth* (ed. Erich Grässer; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), 59–63; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (AB 28, 28A; 2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1981–1985), 1:537; Joseph B. Tyson, “The Gentile Mission and the Authority of Scripture,” *NTS* 33 (1987): 619–31.

Similarly, the first sermons of Peter and Paul contain lengthy expositions of the Jewish scriptures that serve as an extension of the message of Jesus (Acts 2:17–36; 13:13–52). Moreover, Jesus and Paul often teach in Jewish synagogues (e.g., Luke 4:16–30, 31–32, 44; 6:6; 13:10; Acts 13:13–52; 14:1ff; 17:1ff; 18:4ff; 19:8), a location that strongly suggests the inclusion of scriptural reading and exposition.⁶

Luke frequently depicts these sermons as “the word of God” (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ), the “word of the Lord” (ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου), or simply “the word” (ὁ λόγος).⁷ Although this phraseology need not always refer to discourse that includes scriptural exegesis in Luke’s writings, the context in which Luke situates such phrases often suggests that their referent was the proclamation of how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures.⁸ For example, in Luke 4:31–32, he uses ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ to refer to the message that Jesus preached in Capernaum on the Sabbath day. Both the Sabbath synagogue context and the preceding sermon of Jesus (Luke 4:16–30) imply that “his message” (ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ) in Luke 4:31–32 revolved around the interpretation of the Jewish scriptures. Similarly, in Acts 2:41, Luke uses τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ to refer to a message of Peter that essentially consists of scriptural citation and exposition (Acts 2:17–36). Again, in Acts 4:4, Luke uses τὸν λόγον to refer back to the message of Peter in Acts 3:12–26, which clearly includes the citation and interpretation of scripture. Likewise, Luke uses the term λόγος (Acts 13:15) and the phrases τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου (Acts 13:44; cf. 13:48–49) and τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts 13:46) to refer to Paul’s sermon at Pisidian Antioch, a message that centers upon scriptural exposition. Furthermore, in Acts 6:1–5, the Twelve recognize the importance of attending to the “word of God” (λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ) and

⁶ Whether Luke regards the synagogue as a public institution or a more private voluntary association, Sabbath teaching in these types of contexts would typically include the reading and interpretation of the scriptures. This is how Luke elsewhere presents the activities of the synagogue (e.g., Acts 9; 13; 18). For further discussion of evidence for scriptural study in first-century synagogues, see Anders Runesson, *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Sourcebook* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 72; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 208–54.

⁷ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ in Luke 5:1; 8:11, 21; 11:28; Acts 4:31; 6:2, 4, 7; 8:14; 11:1; 12:24; 13:5, 7, 46, 48; 16:32; 17:13; 18:11; 19:20; ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου in Acts 8:25; 13:44, 46, 49; 15:35, 36; 16:32; 19:10; 20:35; and ὁ λόγος in Luke 4:22, 32, 36; 6:47; 8:12, 13, 15; 9:26, 28, 44; 10:39; 21:33; 24:19, 44; Acts 2:22, 40–41; 4:4; 6:4; 8:4; 10:36, 44; 11:19; 13:26; 14:3, 25; 15:7; 16:6; 17:11; 20:7, 32.

⁸ E.g., Luke 4:31–32; Acts 2:41; 4:4; 6:2, 4, 7; (probably 10:44; 15:7); 13:5, 15, 26, 44, 46, 48, 49; 17:11, 13; 18:5; (possibly 18:11); 19:8–10; (possibly 19:20).

therefore devote themselves to prayer and the “ministry of the word” (διακονία τοῦ λόγου). This description suggests that their early activities included the study of the Jewish scriptures.⁹ Therefore, although Luke does not always identify the message of Jesus and his followers as scriptural citation and exegesis, a number of pivotal scenes in his narrative indicate that, for Luke, scriptural interpretation stood at the core of their proclamation.

Second, Luke opens his gospel by likening it to an “account of the events that have been fulfilled among us” (Luke 1:1) and as a narrative of what had been handed down by “eyewitnesses and servants of the word” (Luke 1:2). These introductory statements have the effect of presenting the story that follows as a type of scriptural exposition; they indicate that it contains an account that explains how the Jewish scriptures have been realized through recent events. By beginning his story in this way, Luke presents his own writings as an ongoing expression of the exegetical tradition that began with Christ and was passed down to the first disciples.¹⁰ Even as Luke reports several episodes in which Jesus and the apostles proclaim the fulfillment of the scriptures, so he himself narrates the story of how these sacred texts have been fulfilled.

Like Luke, Justin portrays the Jewish scriptures as central to the proclamation of Christ-believers. This emphasis takes a slightly different form in the works of Justin, however, since Luke and Justin write in different genres. Luke narrates the first-century story of Jesus

⁹ Commentators rarely attempt to describe what Luke might mean by the “ministry of the word” in Acts 6:4. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:313, suggests that this activity refers to the preaching of the apostles, since this is how he interprets the use of the term “word” throughout Acts; cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1988), 183; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 260. Gerhardsson, *Memory & Manuscript*, 245, argues that the “ministry of the word” in Acts 6:1–5 would have included the reading of scripture, together with the recitation of oral traditions about Jesus. That is, it represented “the process of ‘taking stock’ of that which is given in the Scriptures and the tradition of Christ, and that which was revealed in the yet unfinished miraculous course of salvation” (245). In view of the emphasis upon scriptural interpretation throughout Luke-Acts, this latter conclusion seems probable.

¹⁰ Robert G. Hall, *Revealed Histories: Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography* (JSPSup 6; Sheffield: SAP, 1991), 172, notes that Luke attempts to show that he shares the task and message of the disciples, including their inspired interpretation of the Jewish scriptures.

and the birth of the Jesus movement,¹¹ whereas the writings of Justin take the literary form of an apologetic address to the Roman Emperor Antonius Pius (138–160 CE) and, in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, a debate with a Jewish refugee of the Bar Kokhba war (135 CE).¹² Despite these differences, in a manner not unlike Luke, Justin presents the Jewish scriptures as an essential part of the message of Christ-believers and casts himself in the role of a herald of the gospel who perpetuates this exegetical tradition.¹³ Moreover, as in the prologue to Luke-Acts, Justin draws an explicit link between the written traditions about Jesus and the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures.¹⁴

¹¹ There is not wide agreement regarding the precise genre of Luke-Acts but proposals include the following: biography (C. Talbert); novel (R. Pervo); epic (D. MacDonald); and history. Among those who regard Luke-Acts as history, four historical subgenres have been proposed: general history (D. Aune); political history (D. Balch); Deuteronomistic history (T. Brodie); and apologetic history (G. Sterling). The majority of scholars hold that Luke-Acts belongs within the genre of historiography but also recognize that Luke draws upon a wide variety of literary techniques. For helpful resources that discuss this issue at length, see Thomas E. Phillips, "The Genre of Acts: Moving toward a Consensus?" *CBR* 4 (2006): 365–96; cf. Joel B. Green and Michael C. McKeever, eds. *Luke-Acts and New Testament Historiography* (IBR Bibliographies 8; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994); Loveday Alexander, "Fact, Fiction and the Genre of Acts," *NTS* 44 (1998): 380–99; Bock, *Acts*, 8–12. I am taking the prologue in Luke 1:1–4 as an introduction for both Luke and Acts. Regardless of the specific genre in which Luke writes, he clearly aims to narrate an account that describes the life of Jesus and the birth of the Jesus movement.

¹² Justin represents his first *Apology* as an address to members of the imperial court: the Roman emperor Antoninus Pius, his son Marcus Aurelius (Verissimus), and Lucius. On the surface, he appears to petition the state authorities on behalf of Christians in order to obtain relief from prosecution. A number of scholars have argued, however, that the *Apologies* are a fictitious literary creation. See, e.g., Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923), 82–4; cf. Charles Munier, *Saint Justin. Apologie pour les chrétiens: Édition et traduction* (Paradosis 39; Fribourg: L'University de Fribourg, 1995), 182; P. Lorraine Buck, "Justin Martyr's *Apologies*: Their Number, Destination, and Form," *JTS* 54 (2003), 56–9. Similarly, there is no way to determine for certain whether the *Dialogue* reflects an authentic debate. As many have noted, Justin shapes and restricts the role of Trypho in his discourse so that often he functions as little more than a 'straw man' who asks leading questions that serve his apologetic purposes. See, e.g., Niels Hyldahl, "Tryphon and Tarphon," *StTh* (1956): 77–88; Graham N. Stanton, "Justin Martyr's *Dialogue* with Trypho: Group Boundaries, 'Proselytes' and 'God-fearers'" in *Tolerance and Intolerance in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. Graham N. Stanton and Guy G. Stroumsa; Cambridge: CUP, 1998), 263. For a survey of the debate surrounding the origins of the *Dialogue*, see Timothy J. Horner, "Listening to Trypho": *Justin Martyr's Dialogue Reconsidered* (CBET 28; Paris: Leuven, 2001), 16–38.

¹³ E.g., *1 Apol.* 33.1; 34.1; 35.1; 40.1; 45.1; 47.1; 48.1, 4; 49.6; 50.1; 51.6, 8; 52.7; 59.1; 60.8; *Dial.* 22.1; 39.4; 56.6; 62.4; 85.7; 86.1; 87.3; 139.3.

¹⁴ Compare, for example, Luke 1:1–2 with *Dial.* 101.3; 102.5; 104.1–2; 105.1–6; 106.1–4. See also Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christentum*, 267–8.

Justin gives priority to scriptural interpretation in both *1 Apology* and the *Dialogue*. In *1 Apol.* 23.1, for example, he indicates that his message comes from the prophets and Christ, and explains that the scriptures will form the basis for his defense:

“Ἴνα δὲ ἤδη καὶ τοῦτο φανερόν ὑμῖν γένηται, ὅποσα λέγομεν μαθόντες παρὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν προελθόντων αὐτοῦ προφητῶν μόνα ἀληθῆ ἐστὶ καὶ πρεσβύτερα πάντων τῶν γεγεννημένων συγγραφέων. καὶ οὐχὶ διὰ τὸ ταῦτά λέγειν αὐτοῖς παραδεχθῆναι ἀξιούμεν, ἀλλ’ ὅτι τὸ ἀληθὲς λέγομεν.

But in order that this (the uniqueness of the incarnation and the work of Christ)¹⁵ now might become clear to you, as many things as we speak, because we learned (them) from Christ and the prophets who preceded him, are alone true and older than all those who were writers. And we ask to be believed¹⁶ not because we speak the same things (as all those who were writers) but because we speak the truth.

(*1 Apol.* 23.1)

Throughout *1 Apology* Justin also exhorts his readers to recognize the truth of the Jewish scriptures by listening to his explanation of how Christ fulfilled them, and he repeatedly cites and interprets scriptural prophecy in an attempt to prove the veracity of the story and message of Christ (see especially *1 Apology* 31–53). According to Justin, Christ-believers do not trust in statements without proof but in events that were foretold before they happened (*1 Apol.* 30.1). In this way, Justin presents the Jewish scriptures as predictions that authenticate the story of Jesus and the birth of the Christ-believing community.

Not surprisingly, this emphasis upon the scriptures is still more pointed in the *Dialogue*, where Justin has Trypho sum up the debate by expressing the desire to meet again to continue “studying the scriptures themselves” (ἐξετάζοντες αὐτοὺς τοὺς λόγους; *Dial.* 142.1).¹⁷ As

¹⁵ Here I am interpreting τοῦτο as a reference to what Justin has just said about Christ in his preceding argument. See also Minns and Parvis, *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr*, 139.

¹⁶ As Minns and Parvis, *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr*, 139, note, Justin here uses the language of petition. On this use of ἀξιόω, see also Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd. ed., revised and edited by Frederick William Danker (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 94.

¹⁷ In the *Dialogue*, Justin uses both the terms λόγος and γράφη to refer to the Jewish scriptures. For this use of λόγος, see, e.g., *Dial.* 14.3; 25.7; 30.2; 31.2, 7; 32.6; 34.3; 37.3; 38.2; 49.8; 50.2; 51.1; 55.2; 56.3, 4; 60.5; 62.1, 3, 4, 5; 64.4; 67.7; 69.4; 73.1; 77.4; 79.3; 85.6, 8; 86.3; 87.2, 3; 92.5, 6; 93.3; 102.4; 110.3; 114.1; 117.4; 122.1; 126.6; 129.1, 2; 130.1; 131.1; 137.1; 141.2.

Philip Bobichon observes, the *Dialogue* is, in essence, an exegetical exposition of the scriptures that takes a dialogical format.¹⁸ After the prologue of the *Dialogue*, Justin launches a sustained exegetical discussion in the attempt to present Christ as the New Law (*Dialogue* 10–47) and Messiah (*Dialogue* 48–108), and to depict Christ-believers as true Israel (*Dialogue* 109–142). He maintains that he bases his argument “on the scriptures and facts” (*Dial.* 28.2), and sees his participation in this type of exegetical debate as a God-given responsibility and stewardship:

Ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπεῖραι τὸν σπόρον· καὶ ὁ μὲν ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν, ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας, ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη, ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν. Ἐλπίδι οὖν τοῦ εἶναι πον καλὴν γῆν λέγειν δεῖ· ἐπειδὴ γε ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἐμὸς κύριος, ὡς ἰσχυρὸς καὶ δυνατός, τὰ ἴδια παρὰ πάντων ἀπαιτήσῃ ἐλθὼν, καὶ τὸν οἰκονόμον τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οὐ καταδικάσει, εἰ γνωρίζοι αὐτόν, διὰ τὸ ἐπίστασθαι ὅτι δυνατός ἐστιν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐλθὼν ἀπαιτήσῃ τὰ ἴδια, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τράπεζαν δόντα, ἀλλ’ οὐ δι’ αἰτίαν οἰανδοποτοῦν κατορύξαντα.

The sower went out to sow the seed, and some fell on the path, and some in the thorns, and some upon the rocks, but some upon the good ground. It is necessary, therefore, to speak with hope that somewhere there might be good ground. Since, when he comes, my mighty and powerful Lord will demand his possessions from all, and will not condemn his steward if he (the steward) would make it known that, because he (the steward) understands that his Lord is mighty and when he comes will demand his possessions, he (the steward) has deposited to every bank and has not, for any cause whatsoever hidden (the possessions) in the ground. (*Dial.* 125.1–2; cf. Mark 4:10–20; Luke 8:4–18; 19:11–27; Matt 13:3–23; 25:14–30)

By referring to the parable of the sower and the parable of the talents in this passage, Justin portrays his exegesis of the Jewish scriptures as a message analogous with the earlier proclamation of Jesus and his followers. Just as the first disciples understood and proclaimed the true meaning of the scriptures (see, e.g., *1 Apol.* 49.5; 50.12; *Dial.* 53.5; 76.6), so Justin acts as an heir and faithful steward of this exegetical tradition.¹⁹

¹⁸ Philippe Bobichon, *Justin Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon: Edition Critique, Traduction, Commentaire* (Paradosis 47/1; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2005), 1:126–7.

¹⁹ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 11–3, 256.

In sum, both Luke and Justin present the exegesis of the Jewish scriptures as a core element of the message of Christ and Christ-believers, and their own writings as an extension of this interpretative activity. Although the other synoptic gospels affirm that Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures, Luke more pointedly presents scriptural exposition as a central part of the message of Jesus and his disciples.²⁰ Justin writes in a different genre, and draws upon a wider variety of sources and different proof texts in his representation of the exegesis of Christ-believers. Nevertheless, like Luke, he presents scriptural interpretation as a central activity of the Christ-believing community.

2.3 AUTHORITATIVE INSTRUCTION AND REVELATORY ILLUMINATION

2.3.1 *Luke*

The most notable similarities between the accounts of Luke and Justin occur in their respective reports of the post-resurrection teachings of the risen Christ. Their explanations of these events have common peculiarities that are not found in other NT and early second-century Christian writings.²¹ That other authors do not describe these post-resurrection episodes in the same way makes the correspondence between Luke and Justin all the more significant.²² Both authors indicate

²⁰ Compare Luke 4:16–30 with the initial preaching of Jesus in Mark 1:14–15 and Matt 4:17, where Jesus announces the kingdom but does not interpret scripture. Compare also Mark 6:1–6 (cf. Matt 13:53–58), an account that resembles Luke 4:16–30 but does not emphasize scriptural interpretation as Luke does.

²¹ These similarities between their records of the passion predictions and post-resurrection teachings of Christ (Luke 9:45; 18:31–32; 24:13–53; Acts 1:1–11; *1 Apol.* 50.12; *Dial.* 53.5; 76.6; 106.1), in particular, lead Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 11–3, 256, to conclude that Justin probably knew and depended on Lukan traditions, either directly or indirectly. Similarly, Andrew Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century* (Tübingen: Mohr Seibek, 2003), 290–1, concludes that Justin draws upon material that is known to us from the end of Luke and suggests that this provides evidence that Justin depends on a Lukan source or the redactional material from the canonical Gospel of Luke.

²² Compare the commissioning of the twelve in the *Epistle of the Apostles* 30 (cf. ch. 19): “But he said unto us: Go and preach unto the twelve tribes, and preach also unto the heathen, and to all the land of Israel from the east to the west and from the south unto the north, and many shall believe on <me> the Son of God....Go and preach the mercifulness of my Father, and that which he hath done through me will I myself do through you, for I am in you, and I will give you my peace, and I will give you a power of my spirit, that ye may prophesy to them unto life eternal.” Although this text indicates that the apostles would teach Paul about how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures (see ch. 31), it does not refer to scriptural interpretation in its account

that the risen Christ provided an explanation of how he had fulfilled the Jewish scriptures, and both indicate that this was part of his earlier message to them.²³ In these accounts, Luke and Justin also explain how Christ-believers came to possess an inspired interpretation of the Jewish scriptures, and they use similar strategies to portray this exegesis as authoritative. For Luke, the process by which the first disciples arrive at a correct understanding of the Jewish scriptures involves two important prerequisites: the instruction of the risen Christ and divine revelation. In Luke 24:25–27 and 24:46–47, Jesus explains how the scriptures foretell his death and resurrection, and the inclusion of the nations. By providing this explanation, he in essence teaches the disciples how to read the Jewish scriptures correctly:

καὶ αὐτὸς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, ὦ ἀνόητοι καὶ βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ πιστεύειν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφῆται· οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ; καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἐαυτοῦ.

Then he said to them, “O foolish ones and slow in heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken. Was it not necessary for the Messiah to suffer these things and to enter into his glory?” Then beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted for them the things about himself in all the scriptures.
(Luke 24:25–27)

Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς, Οὔτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὢν σὺν ὑμῖν, ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ. τότε διήνοιξεν

of the commissioning of the twelve. See also the account of this commissioning in the *Kerygma Petrou*: “Accordingly, in the Preaching of Peter, the Lord says to the disciples after the resurrection, ‘I have chosen you twelve disciples, judging you worthy of me,’ whom the Lord wished to be apostles, having judged them faithful, sending them into the world to the men on the earth, that they may know that there is one God, showing clearly what would take place by the faith of Christ; that they who heard and believed should be saved; and that those who believed not, after having heard, should bear witness” (*Strom.* 6.6, Clement of Alexandria). Although fragments of the *Kerygma Petrou* refer to the scriptural interpretation of the apostles (*Strom.* 15.128), they do not associate the exegesis of the apostles with their commissioning by Christ nor do they present it as the outcome of a revelation from the risen Christ. Note also that no mention of scriptural interpretation occurs in the description of the commissioning of the apostles in the *Apology of Aristides* 2 or in the descriptions of the mission of the apostles in *The Shepherd of Hermas* (IX:17.1–4; 25.2).

²³ Compare Luke 24:44–46; 1 *Apology*, 50.12; *Dial.* 53.5; 106.1. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 256, and Gregory, *Reception of Luke*, 284–5, also note these distinctive elements in the gospel of Luke and the writings of Justin.

αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς· καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι Οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἅφρασιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων. καὶ [ἰδοὺ] ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς· ὑμεῖς δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν.

Then he said to them, "These are my words that I spoke to you while I was still with you—that everything written about me in the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms must be fulfilled." Then he opened their minds to understand the scriptures, and said to them: "Thus it is written, that the Messiah should suffer and rise from the dead on the third day and that repentance for forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things. And [see], I am sending the promise of my Father upon you; but stay in the city until you are clothed with power from on high."

(Luke 24:44–49)

These passages have a uniquely Lukan flavor. Whereas Matthew has Jesus commission the eleven to make disciples of all nations by teaching them to observe all that he had commanded them (Matt 28:19–20), and the longer secondary ending of Mark has Jesus indicate that the disciples "proclaimed the good news everywhere" after the ascension of Jesus (Mark 16:19–20), the Lukan Jesus interprets the scriptures for the disciples (Luke 24:25–27) and charges them with the mission of perpetuating this message (Luke 24:44–48).²⁴ Luke does not simply indicate that the disciples recall certain scriptural passages and from this perceive how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures.²⁵ Rather, he carefully reports that the risen Christ divulged the true meaning of the scriptures directly to the disciples and, in so doing, demonstrates the authoritative origin of their exegesis.

²⁴ Luke does not have Jesus cite a particular passage from the Jewish scriptures in Luke 24:25–27, 44–47, but refers to the necessity of his fulfillment of the law of Moses, the prophets, and the Psalms: in other words, the totality of scripture. The particularly Lukan character of these passages has long been noted, and the risen Christ's exposition of the mystery of the passion in light of his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures is also commonly recognized as a Lukan theme. See, e.g., Conzelmann, *Luke*, 157–9; U. Wilckens, *Die Missionreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchungen* (WMANT 5; Neukirchener Verlag, 1974), 98 n. 1; Richard J. Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24* (AB 82; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 167; I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection of Jesus in Luke," *TynBul* 24 (1973): 91; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:294.

²⁵ Contrast, e.g., John 2:17, 22; 12:16; 20:9.

Besides highlighting that the risen Christ himself explained the correct meaning of the scriptures to the disciples, Luke indicates that they required a revelatory experience to comprehend them: Jesus had to open their minds (Luke 24:45).²⁶ This reference to the mind-opening of the disciples suggests that they needed supernatural assistance to grasp the scriptural interpretation of Jesus. Indeed, immediately prior to this revelatory encounter, Luke recalls their inability to understand Jesus' previous explanations of how he would fulfill the Jewish scriptures (Luke 24:44; 18:31–33).²⁷ The use of the passive constructions in these earlier contexts—*ἦν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο κεκρυμμένον ἅπ' αὐτῶν* in Luke 18:34 (cf. Luke 9:45)—suggests that their lack of understanding was due to divine concealment; the confusion of the disciples was not simply a matter of being unable to make sense of what Jesus was saying.²⁸ By having Jesus recall these earlier scenes directly before he

²⁶ In addition to demonstrating the need for this initial revelatory experience of the eleven, Luke sometimes indicates that other Christ-believers also require special revelation to understand the Jewish scriptures. For example, in the scene where the Lukan Jesus explains the Jewish scriptures to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:25–27), Luke indicates that the identity of Jesus was revealed to them (Luke 24:31). The use of the passive verb *διηνοιχθῆσαν* in the phrase *αὐτῶν δὲ διηνοιχθῆσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν* suggests that they received a supernatural experience similar to that of the eleven (compare *διήνοιξεν* in Luke 24:45). Moreover, the description of the experience of the eleven in Luke 24:45 resembles the description of Lydia in Acts 16:14b: “The Lord opened her heart to listen eagerly to what was said by Paul” (*ὁ κύριος διήνοιξεν τὴν καρδίαν προσέχειν τοῖς λαλουμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου*). Since Luke typically associates scriptural interpretation with proclamations that occur in this type of context (e.g., Luke 4:16–21; Acts 13:13–41), he probably assumes that the preaching at a “place of prayer” on the Sabbath day includes exposition of the Jewish scriptures.

²⁷ Luke indicates that the disciples did not understand how the death of Jesus would fulfill the Jewish scriptures whereas Matthew and Mark indicate that they did not understand Jesus' own predictions about his death. Compare the following passages: Matt 20:17–19; Mark 9:32; 10:32–34; Luke 18:31–34. William Wrede, *The Messianic Secret* (trans. J. C. G. Greig; Greenwood, SC: Attic Press, 1971), 170, 179, argues that Luke changed the Markan messianic secret to a passion secret; cf. Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 24.

²⁸ Note also the use of the passive in Luke 24:16. I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 394, also argues that the use of *κρύπτω* in Luke 18:34 (*ἦν . . . κεκρυμμένον ἅπ' αὐτῶν*) expresses this idea; the concealment from the disciples represents a “divine ‘veiling’ of what was said” (691). Similarly, Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (2 vols. BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994–1996), argues that Luke 9:45 and 18:34 imply that God or some other spiritual force withheld comprehension from the disciples: “Putting the pieces together was an ability that God had not yet granted to the disciples” (2:1499; cf. 1:889); cf. François Bovon, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50* (Hermeneia; trans. Christine M. Thomas; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 393; Craig Evans, *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6:9–10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation* (JSNTSup 64; Sheffield:

opened the minds of the disciples, Luke emphasizes that the correct interpretation of the scriptures required more than a simple exposition of them. A revelation from Christ, together with his exegetical instruction, was essential to their proper understanding of the true meaning of these sacred texts. Moreover, Luke indicates that further divine enablement to proclaim this message would come through the empowerment of the Spirit (Luke 24:49; cf. Acts 1:8).

The post-resurrection instruction and revelatory experience of the disciples serves as part of the process by which they become authoritative transmitters of the interpretive tradition that Christ entrusted to them. Only after Jesus opened their minds and explained the scriptures to them did they receive the mandate to bear witness to his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures (Luke 24:48).²⁹ Yet Luke also demonstrates how subsequent Christ-believers gain access to and participate in proclaiming this revelation. For example, he presents the preaching of Peter, Philip, and Paul as a continuation of the scriptural interpretation that Jesus entrusted to the disciples in Luke 24:44–47.³⁰ Luke

SAP, 1989), 120. A. F. Loisy, *L'Evangile selon Luc* (Paris: Emile Nourry, 1924), 280, notes that although Mark presents the disciples as stubborn and therefore unable to understand, Luke attributes their misunderstanding to God. Against this consensus, Kenneth Duncan Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (JSNTSup 282; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 138–9, argues that the inability of the disciples “to grasp Jesus’ statements was not based on divine veiling but on the inability of their imaginations to integrate what Jesus was saying to them with their understanding of Jesus” (138). He asserts that Luke 9:45; 18:34; 24:44–47 do not indicate that there was a supernatural element related to the disciples’ misunderstanding but only a hermeneutical one. He maintains that the disciples could not understand the suffering and shame in the message of Jesus because it did not correspond to their expectations; cf. Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 661. To reach this conclusion, however, Litwak must argue that the explanation in Luke 24:44–47 was somehow able to correct their misunderstanding in a manner that his former explanation in Luke 18:31–34 did not. This seems unlikely since both passages contain parallel explanations of Christ’s fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures: he would suffer, die, and rise on the third day. Since the disciples received essentially the same explanation in both passages, their inability to perceive the scriptures would probably not be remedied by the repeated explanation in Luke 24:44–47 if their difficulty was only hermeneutical.

²⁹ In the context of Luke 24:44–47, the phrase ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων in Luke 24:48 almost certainly indicates that Luke sees Christ’s fulfillment of the scriptures as a central part of the message of the disciples. See further discussion of this phrase in Chapter Four.

³⁰ E.g., Acts 2:22–36; 3:17–26; 8:26–40; 10:34–43; 13:16–41; 26:22–23; 28:23–25. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:285, points out that the speeches in Acts stand in continuity with the preparation of the apostles for mission in Luke 24 and similarly assert that Jesus’ death fulfilled the plan of God (Acts 2:23; 4:28) and the Jewish

thus highlights the authority of the scriptural interpretation of the first disciples by showing how it originates with the teaching and divine enablement of the risen Christ and portrays this exegetical tradition as a revelation that subsequent Christ-believers perpetuate.

The story of the encounter between Philip and the Ethiopian official (Acts 8:26–40) serves as an especially clear example of how Luke illustrates the continuation of the scriptural interpretation that originated with the risen Christ. Scholars have often noted the links between Acts 8:26–40 and the post-resurrection instruction of Christ in Luke 24.³¹ Even as Jesus unlocks the true meaning of the scriptures to the disciples in Luke 24:25–27, 44–47, so Philip provides an exegetical explanation of Isa 53:7–8 that enables the Ethiopian to understand this ancient text. By placing the citation of Isa 53:7–8 at the center of his account, Luke highlights the significance of scriptural interpretation for this episode and reiterates how the Jewish scriptures predict that the messiah must suffer (cf. Luke 24:46).³² As in Luke 24:44–47, Luke does not here

scriptures (Acts 3:18; 13:27–29); cf. Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (SP 3; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991), 403. Similarly, Jacques Dupont, *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (trans. John R. Keating; New York: Paulist, 1979), 129–54, demonstrates that the essential three points from the Jewish scriptures that Jesus outlines in Luke 24:44–49 (Christ must suffer, Christ must rise from the dead, and his message must be proclaimed to the nations) correspond to the central points of the preaching of his followers in Acts (e.g., Acts 2:17–36; 3:17–26; 10:34–43; 13:13–41; 26:22–23). For further discussion regarding the close correspondence between the themes outlined in Luke 24:44–49 and the sermons in Acts, see Conzelmann, *Luke*, 157; Wilckens, *Missionreden*, 99–100; Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 212–5; Hall, *Revealed Histories*, 188–9.

³¹ See, e.g., Barrett, *Acts*, 1:428, who sees a parallel between the Ethiopian's failure to understand the meaning of Isa 53:7–8 and the description of the disciples in Luke 24:13–35. He also suggests a close link between the description of the process of scriptural interpretation in both contexts (Luke 24:27 ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν; Acts 8:35 ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης); cf. David P. Moessner, "The Script of the Scriptures in Acts: suffering as God's 'plan' (βουλὴ) for the world for the 'release of sins,'" in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed. Ben Witherington III; Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 230–2. Darrell Bock, "Scripture and the Realisation of God's Promises," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 53–4, suggests that Acts 8:35 and Luke 24:43–47 provide parallel summary appeals to scripture "where one text is cited, but others exist on the theme" (54); cf. Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 112, who also points out that both Philip and the risen Christ meet travelers, engage in dialogue with them, and provide an exposition of the scriptures.

³² The chiastic structure of Acts 8:26–40 places the citation from Isa 53:7–8 and the Ethiopian's questions about its interpretation at the center of the account (Acts 8:30–34). Although scholars draw varying conclusions about the precise center of the chiastic structure, they often note the presence of chiasm in Acts 8:26–40 and generally conclude that the citation and interpretation of scripture serve as a central part of the

provide a detailed description of the scriptural interpretation itself. Instead, he reports a dialogue that serves as a model for what occurs through the ongoing exegesis of the Christ-believing community.³³ In continuity with his depiction of the authoritative exegesis of the first disciples, moreover, Luke uses this account to demonstrate the legitimacy of the scriptural interpretation and proclamation of Philip.

Through his presentation of the question-answer interaction in the episode, Luke provides a close-up account of how Philip helps the Ethiopian to understand the scriptures (Acts 8:30–35).³⁴ When Philip hears him reading from Isaiah, he poses an initial question: “Do you understand what you are reading?” (Acts 8:30b). Such a query assumes that the meaning of the text is not self-evident; that the Ethiopian could read the passage did not ensure that he could understand it. Similarly, the question that the Ethiopian asks in response to Philip’s question—“How can I, unless someone guides me?” (Acts 8:31a)—suggests that correct interpretation requires the proper instruction of an informed interpretive guide.³⁵ Accordingly, in response to the third question of the Ethiopian official—“About whom, may I ask you, does the prophet say this, about himself or about someone else?” (Acts 8:24)—Philip

passage. See, e.g., R. F. O’Toole, “Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch (Acts VIII 25–40),” *JSNT* 17 (1983): 25–34; Dionisio Minguez, “Hechos 8:25–40: análisis estructural del relato,” *Bib* 57 (1976): 168–91; F. Scott Spencer, *The Portrait of Philip in Acts: A Study of Roles and Relations* (JSNTSup 67; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 132; Christopher von Mueller, “Leserorientierte Fragen im Erzählwerk des Lukas,” *TGl* 93 (2003): 45.

³³ As von Mueller, “Leserorientierte,” 46, observes, the story of the Ethiopian provides a model of one who is in search of God and truth; cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 411, who argues that the episode “teaches Christians how they must learn to interpret the Hebrew Scriptures and learn from others, even as the eunuch sought understanding from Philip.” As Tyson, “Gentile Mission,” 623, maintains, the “crux of the matter [in this episode] is the correct interpretation of a prophetic scripture.”

³⁴ On the significance of the question-answer format as a means of demonstrating searching and vivid communication in the ancient world, see von Mueller, “Leserorientierte,” 28, 46–7. According to von Mueller, the account provides a paradigm of a person who is searching for God and the truth. In his view, the question-answer format deepens the faith process and orients the reader to identify with this aspect of the account.

³⁵ Just as Luke portrays the need for Jesus to transmit the correct interpretation of the Jewish scriptures in Luke 24:25–27, 44–47, so he indicates in Acts 8:30–31 that proper perception of the scriptures requires someone to guide the interpretive process. As Barrett, *Acts*, 1:428, observes, these passages indicate that Luke does not regard the Jewish scriptures as self-explanatory. They require the mediation of an informed, or authoritative, interpreter; cf. Jacob Jervell, *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), 130. George T. Montague, *Understanding the Bible: A Basic Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (New York: Paulist, 1997), 7–8, suggests that Philip acts as just such an interpreter.

provides an explanation that indicates how the Jewish scriptures refer to Christ (Acts 8:35). These elements of the dialogue between Philip and the Ethiopian demonstrate Philip's status as an authoritative interpreter of scripture; he possesses the proper instructional insight that will enable the Ethiopian to understand the scriptures correctly.

Luke also closely links scriptural interpretation to divine revelation in this passage, but he does so by emphasizing the inspired status of Philip rather than by describing the revelatory experience of the Ethiopian. For example, he prefaces their encounter with a description of the divine direction that Philip receives: the angel of the Lord instructs him to go to the road that runs from Jerusalem to Gaza (Acts 8:26). Luke also indicates that the Spirit directed Philip to approach the chariot of the Ethiopian (Acts 8:29). By opening the scene in this way, Luke shows how the entire exchange between them was arranged by God. As one who has been sent by God, Philip acts as a divinely inspired emissary who discloses the correct interpretation of the Jewish scriptures to the Ethiopian.

Subsequent to Philip's exposition of the Jewish scriptures and proclamation of Jesus, the Ethiopian asks a final question: "What is to prevent me from being baptized?" (Acts 8:36). The implicit answer—"nothing"—suggests that all the requirements for his baptism have been met; nothing hinders his inclusion once he believes Philip's authoritative scriptural interpretation and proclamation about Jesus.³⁶ Thus, in addition to presenting Philip as a divinely inspired messenger and informed exegete of the Jewish scriptures, the story demonstrates how the positive reception of the message and scriptural interpretation of the disciples of Jesus functions as a precursor to entrance to the Christ-believing community.³⁷

³⁶ Apparently, the cryptic description of the Ethiopian's conversion was problematic for some early interpreters since some Western manuscripts provide an additional statement: "Then Philip said, 'If you believe with all your heart, you may.' And he answered and said, 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God'" (E, many minuscules, it^{sig. h} vg^{ms} syr^h with * cop^{G67} arm). In *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition* (Stuttgart: UBS, 1998), 315, Bruce M. Metzger explains the addition in this way: "Its insertion into the text seems to have been due to the feeling that Philip would not have baptized the Ethiopian without securing a confession of faith, which needed to be expressed in the narrative." The insertion itself suggests that Luke did not provide criteria for baptism other than the Ethiopian's reception of the scriptural interpretation that Philip provides.

³⁷ I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 161, summarizes the event: "The Ethiopian is led to faith by the realization that the prophetic scriptures are fulfilled in Jesus."

2.3.2 *Justin*

Justin refers to the post-resurrection exegetical instruction of Jesus in four different passages, which attests to his emphasis upon this element of the mission of the apostles. In his first *Apology*, he indicates that the apostles proclaimed the message about Christ to the nations and entrusted the scriptures to them:

οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν, μηδέποτε μηδὲν ἀκούσαντες περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μέχρις οὗ οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐξελθόντες ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ ἐμήνυσαν τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς προφητείας παρέδωκαν, πληρωθέντες χαρᾶς καὶ πίστεως τοῖς εἰδώλοις ἀπετάζαντο καὶ τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἑαυτοὺς ἀνέθηκαν.

But those who were from the nations never heard anything about Christ until when his apostles went out from Jerusalem and made known the things about him and handed over the prophecies. Then, being filled with joy and faith, they turned away from the idols, and dedicated themselves to the unbegotten God through Christ.

(1 *Apol.* 49.5)

As he explains in 1 *Apol.* 50.12 and *Dial.* 53.5, this means that the apostles transmitted the interpretation of the biblical prophecies that Christ handed down to them after his resurrection:

μετὰ οὖν τὸ σταυρωθῆναι αὐτόν, καὶ οἱ γνώριμοι αὐτοῦ πάντες ἀπέστησαν, ἀρνησάμενοι αὐτόν· ὕστερον δέ, ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντος καὶ ὀφθέντος αὐτοῖς καὶ ταῖς προφητείαις ἐντυχεῖν ἐν αἷς πάντα ταῦτα προεῖρητο γενησόμενα διδάξαντος, καὶ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνερχόμενον ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες καὶ δύνανμιν³⁸ ἐκεῖθεν αὐτοῖς πεμφθεῖσαν παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβόντες καὶ εἰς πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων ἐλθόντες, ταῦτα ἐδίδασκαν, καὶ ἀπόστολοι προσηγορεύθησαν.

Therefore, after he was crucified, even his acquaintances, having denied him, all stood aloof. But afterward, when he arose from the dead and appeared to them, and taught them to read the prophecies in which all these things were predicted as going to happen, and when they saw him ascend into heaven and believed and received power, which was sent there to them from him, they went to every race of human beings and taught these things, and they were called apostles.

(1 *Apol.* 50.12)

³⁸ Although Luke and Justin use different wording, both authors indicate that the disciples saw Jesus ascend into heaven and afterward received “power” (δύναμις) to proclaim the correct interpretation of the scriptures (Luke 24:49–53; cf. Acts 1:8–9).

Ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ζαχαρίου, ὅτι παταχθήσεται αὐτὸς οὗτος ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, προεφητεύθη· ὅπερ καὶ γέγονε. Μετὰ γὰρ τὸ σταυρωθῆναι αὐτὸν οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ὄντες μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ διεσκεδάσθησαν, μέχρις ὅτου ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ πέπεικεν αὐτοὺς ὅτι οὕτως προεπεφήτετο περὶ αὐτοῦ παθεῖν αὐτόν· καὶ οὕτως πεισθέντες καὶ εἰς τὴν πᾶσαν οἰκουμένην ἐξελθόντες ταῦτα ἐδίδασκαν.

But also through the prophet Zechariah it was foretold that this same Christ would be struck, and his disciples would be scattered (Zech 13:7), which also has happened. For, after he was crucified, his disciples, who were with him, were dispersed until he arose from the dead, and had persuaded them that it had been predicted about him that he would suffer in this way. And when they were persuaded thus, they went out into all the world and taught these things.

(*Dial.* 53.5)

Similarly, in *Dial.* 76.6–7, Justin asserts that no one was able to understand the prophecies of scripture—not even the apostles—before Christ explained their meaning:

Εἰ <καὶ> γὰρ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν παρακεκαλυμμένως κεκήρυκτο παθητὸς γενησόμενος ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πάντων κυριεύσων, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν οὐδενὸς νοεῖσθαι ἐδύνατο μέχρις αὐτὸς ἔπεισε τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς ταῦτα κεκηρύχθαι διαρρήδην.

For <even> if through the prophets it had been announced cryptically that Christ would suffer and after these things would become Lord of all, it was therefore indeed impossible to be understood by anyone until he himself convinced the apostles that these things had been announced expressly in the scriptures.

(*Dial.* 76.6–7)

By presenting the explanation of the risen Christ as the source of the apostles’ understanding of the scriptures (*1 Apol.* 49.5; 50.12; *Dial.* 53.5; 76.6–7) and indicating that they received power from him to proclaim the correct interpretation of the scriptures (*1 Apol.* 50.12), these accounts demonstrate the authoritative origin of their scriptural exegesis.

The description in *Dial.* 76.6–7 especially demonstrates the dependence of the apostles upon Christ for their understanding of the scriptures: no one could grasp their meaning apart from the convincing explanation of Christ. Furthermore, Justin elsewhere reports that the risen Jesus reminded the disciples that he had predicted his sufferings and explained how his death would fulfill the Jewish scriptures even before his passion: “The apostles, after he arose from the dead and were convinced by him that he had told them before the passion that he had to suffer these things, and that this was foretold by the

prophets, repented for abandoning him when he was crucified” (*Dial.* 106.1). This part of Justin’s account closely parallels the recollection of Christ’s passion predictions in Luke 24:44 (cf. Luke 18:31–33).³⁹ In a manner very similar to Luke, Justin highlights the authoritative status of the exegesis of the apostles by showing it to be a disclosure that only the risen Christ could provide.⁴⁰

Elsewhere, Justin indicates that Christ-believers possess a privileged understanding of the scriptures by attributing their exegesis to divine revelatory insight, just as Luke does. For example, in the opening of the *Dialogue*, Justin recounts his attempts to discover the truth about God through the study of different branches of philosophy. During this search, he encounters a mysterious “old man” who explains that the Jewish scriptures were the only reliable source of truth:

Ἐγένοντό τινες πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου πάντων τούτων τῶν νομιζομένων φιλοσόφων παλαιότεροι, μακάριοι καὶ δίκαιοι καὶ θεοφιλεῖς, θείῳ πνεύματι λαλήσαντες καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα θεσπίσαντες, ἃ δὴ νῦν γίνεται· προφήτας δὲ αὐτοὺς καλοῦσιν. Οὗτοι μόνοι τὸ ἀληθὲς καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἐξεῖπον ἀνθρώποις, μήτ’ εὐλαβηθέντες μήτε δυσωπηθέντες τινά, μὴ ἡττημένοι δόξης, ἀλλὰ μόνα ταῦτα εἰπόντες ἃ ἤκουσαν καὶ ἃ εἶδον ἀγίῳ πληρωθέντες πνεύματι. Συγγράμματα δὲ αὐτῶν ἔτι καὶ νῦν διαμένει, καὶ ἔστιν ἐντυχόντα τούτοις πλεῖστον ὠφεληθῆναι καὶ περὶ ἀρχῶν καὶ περὶ τέλους καὶ ὧν χρὴ εἰδέναι τὸν φιλόσοφον, πιστεῦσαντα ἐκείνοις... Εὐχου δέ σοι πρὸ πάντων φωτὸς ἀνοιχθῆναι πύλας· οὐ γὰρ συνοπτά <ταῦτα> οὐδὲ συνοητά πᾶσιν ἐστίν, εἰ μὴ τῷ θεῷ δῶ συνίεναι καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς αὐτοῦ.

A long time ago, certain ones lived who were more ancient than all these so-called philosophers, blessed and righteous and loved by God, who spoke by the divine Spirit and predicted the things about to happen, which are now taking place. Now they call them prophets. They alone perceived and communicated the truth to humans, and they neither deferred to nor feared anyone. Having no desire for personal glory, they spoke only the things which they heard and saw when they were filled with the Holy Spirit. Their writings still now remain, and the one who reads and believes them profits greatly (in his knowledge) about ancient things and end things, and about what a philosopher ought

³⁹ As Gregory, *Reception of Luke*, 285, and Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 256, both note, the link between Christ’s pre-passion predictions from the scriptures and his post-resurrection teaching regarding Christ’s fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures is peculiar to Luke and Justin.

⁴⁰ Although Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 22, asserts that, unlike Luke 24, Justin presents the prophetic writings as “transparent forecasts of the passion and resurrection” that require no explanation, this conclusion appears to depend exclusively upon *1 Apol.* 50.12 without consideration of the other passages where Justin describes the transmission of scriptural interpretation from Christ to the disciples.

to know.... But above all, pray that the gates of light be opened for you; for <these things> (i.e., the writings of the prophets) are neither perceived nor understood by all, except for the one to whom God and his Christ might give understanding.⁴¹
(*Dial.* 7.1–3)

The “old man” indicates that no one could perceive the truth of scriptural prophecy apart from receiving illumination and understanding from God and his Christ (*Dial.* 7.3).⁴² In the passage that immediately follows, moreover, Justin describes his own conversion to Christianity as just such a moment of divine enablement: a fire ignites in his soul and a love for the prophets and for those who were the “friends of Christ”⁴³ possesses him (*Dial.* 8.1). Besides indicating that correct understanding of the scriptures requires inspired revelation, then, Justin directly links this revelatory ability with the experience of becoming a Christ-believer.⁴⁴

Throughout the *Dialogue*, Justin repeatedly identifies Christ-believers as those who have received a divine enablement, or “grace,” to understand the Jewish scriptures (*Dial.* 30.1; 58.1; 78.10–11; 92.1; 100.2; 119.1).⁴⁵ Although Justin does not explicitly outline what he means

⁴¹ Although Thomas P. Halton, *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho* (ed. Michael Slusser; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2003), 14, represents the final phrase of *Dial.* 7.3 as “no one can perceive or understand these truths unless he has been enlightened by God and his Christ,” my rendering seeks to provide a more literal translation that helps to demonstrate the way that Justin presents the correct interpretation of the prophets as an exclusive gift of enlightenment.

⁴² Note also that, in *Dial.* 23.3, Justin refers back to this encounter with the old man and indicates that he received “heavenly doctrine” (θεῖον λόγον) from him.

⁴³ G. N. Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 97, suggests that the phrase “friends of Christ” refers to the apostles and, by implication, their writings; cf. Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christentum*, 229. J. C. M. Van Winden, *An Early Christian Philosopher: Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Trypho Chapters One to Nine* (Philosophia Patrum 1; Leiden: Brill, 1971), 118–9, suggests instead that the phrase refers to Christ-believers of Justin’s own time, especially martyrs; cf. Oskar Skarsaune, “The Conversion of Justin Martyr,” *ST* 30 (1976): 58. Justin elsewhere uses the phrase “memoirs of the apostles” to refer to the writings of the apostles (*1 Apol.* 33.5; 66.3; *Dial.* 100.4; 101.3; 102.5; 103.6, 8; 104.1; 105.1, 5, 6; 106.1, 3, 4).

⁴⁴ A. Hofer, “The Old Man as Christ in Justin’s Dialogue with Trypho,” *VC* 57 (2003): 1–21, argues that Justin attempts to model his conversion story after Luke 24.

⁴⁵ The terminology and syntax that Justin uses to describe the gift of understanding that Christ-believers receive differs slightly in these passages but the meaning in each case is essentially the same. See, for example, *Dial.* 30.1 (χάριν [παρὰ θεοῦ] τοῦ γινῶναι); *Dial.* 58.1 (χάρις παρὰ θεοῦ μόνῃ εἰς τὸ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς αὐτοῦ); 78.10–11 (χάριν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ...μανθάνειν); 92.1 (χάριτος τῆς παρὰ θεοῦ λάβοι νοῆσαι τὰ εἰρημένα καὶ γεγεννημένα ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν); 100.2 (Ἀπεκάλυψεν οὖν ἡμῖν πάντα ὅσα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ νενόηκαμεν); 119.1 (ἐλάβομεν χάριν τοῦ νοῆσαι).

by the phrase “grace to understand,” through his emphasis upon the necessity of praying for illumination (*Dial.* 7.3) and his description of the inability of humans to perceive God apart from the agency of the Holy Spirit (*Dial.* 3.6; 4.1; 7.3), he implies that the experience of receiving “grace to understand” the scriptures requires a divine, or supernatural, enablement.⁴⁶ Justin thus attempts to identify Christ-believers as recipients of a divine revelation that enables them to comprehend the Jewish scriptures, as Luke also does.

For Justin, the special ability of Christ-believers to comprehend the scriptures corresponds closely to the divinely-inspired status of the Jewish scriptures themselves. In his view, the writings of the prophets were the only reliable source of truth because these ancient figures did not produce their compositions through their own efforts to perceive God. Rather, they wrote “only the things which they heard and saw when they were filled with the Holy Spirit” (*Dial.* 7.1; cf. 4.1).⁴⁷ By

⁴⁶ The meaning of the phrase “grace to understand” is widely disputed. David Aune, “Justin Martyr’s Use of the Old Testament,” *BETS* 9 (1966): 182, 186–7, argues that Justin saw himself as analogous to the Hebrew prophets and understood his ability to perceive their writings as “charismatic illumination.” Similarly, N. Pycke, “Connaissance rationnelle et connaissance de grace chez saint Justin,” *ETL* 37 (1961): 52–85, maintains that Justin views his ability to understand the scriptures as a supernatural endowment of knowledge. By contrast, R. Joly, *Christianisme et Philosophie: Etudes sur Justin et les Apologistes grecs du Deuxième Siècle* (Bruxelles: l’Université de Bruxelles, 1973), 104–13, argues that “grace to understand” refers to his ability to provide rational proof from the Jewish scriptures. Similarly, Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 12, concludes that the phrase “grace to understand” refers to the transmission of Christ’s teachings rather than to a charismatic experience; cf. Anette Rudolph, “Denn wir sind jenes Volk...”: *Die neue Gottesverehrung in Justins Dialog mit dem Juden Tryphon in historisch-theologischer Sicht* (Studien zur Alten Kirchengeschichte 15; Bonn: Borengässer, 1999), 92–4, who suggests the following: “Die Traditionslinie verläuft damit vom auferstandenen Christus über die Apostel direct zu Justin. Er ist in seiner Schriftauslegung Schüler der Apostel und gibt die von ihnen empfangene Lehre weiter” (94). With Skarsaune, Rudolph regards Justin’s references to “grace to understand” as the reception of this apostolic teaching (e.g., *Dial.* 58.1). The conclusions of Skarsaune and Rudolph, however, do not adequately account for the way that Justin describes his own conversion as the experience of having his soul “set on fire” (*Dial.* 8.1), nor do they appear to take into consideration the old man’s description of the need for illumination (*Dial.* 7.3). Although the phrases “gates of light,” “grace to understand,” and “set on fire” do not explain the precise nature of the revelation that Justin received, they imply that correct understanding occurred as a result of divine, or supernatural, intervention. Moreover, in *Dial.* 58.1 and 78.10–11, Justin indicates that the source of this “grace to understand” the scriptures was God. These descriptions suggest that receiving “grace to understand” includes divine agency as well as the transmission of the apostles’ teaching.

⁴⁷ Even as the human mind required the assistance of the Holy Spirit to perceive God (*Dial.* 4.1), so the prophets wrote about what the Holy Spirit enabled them to

juxtaposing this description of the Jewish prophets with the exhortation to pray for divine enlightenment (*Dial.* 7.3), Justin draws an important connection between the inspired status of the scriptures and the revelatory gift of those who read them correctly. Just as the prophets “alone perceived and communicated the truth to humans” because the Holy Spirit inspired them (*Dial.* 7.1) so only those who read their writings with faith (*Dial.* 7.2) and with a divinely bestowed capacity to understand their meaning (*Dial.* 7.3) would gain access to the ancient knowledge contained within the Jewish scriptures.

Summary

Although they express themselves in distinctive ways, and write in different genres, Luke and Justin present the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers as authoritative in a notably similar manner. This emphasis upon the privileged status of the exegesis of the Christ-believing community resembles the presentation of scriptural interpretation in a number of early Jewish texts. Additionally, both Luke and Justin emphasize that Christ-believers have received exegetical instruction from the risen Christ himself and both assert that Christ-believers alone have received divine inspiration to interpret these sacred texts. The stress upon the necessity of receiving exegetical instruction from Christ, in particular, resembles the focus upon the authoritative exegesis of the founder of the community in certain Qumran texts (e.g., 1QpHab 1:16–2:10; 7:1–5; 1QH^a 12:5–29).⁴⁸

hear and see (*Dial.* 7.1). For further discussion of the connection between *Dial.* 4.1 and 7.1, see Van Winden, *Philosopher*, 70. By contrast, Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christendom*, 191–2, denies a conceptual link between the two passages and even argues that the original text of *Dial.* 4.1 would not have included the phrase *μη ἀγίῳ πνεύματι κεκοσμημένος*. This forms part of Hyldahl’s wider argument that Justin does not mention the Christian faith until later in the *Dialogue*.

⁴⁸ Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 46–7, argues that the author of Luke-Acts added the post-resurrection teaching about the scriptures to the pre-canonical form of the Gospel of Luke in order to counter the claims of Marcion. Yet the close correspondence between the presentation of authoritative scriptural interpretation by Luke and early Jewish interpreters suggests that the challenge of Marcion need not serve as the only explanation for Luke’s emphasis upon the scriptures and the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers.

2.4 IMPORTANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EXEGESIS OF LUKE AND JUSTIN

Although Luke and Justin similarly assert that Christ-believers possess an authoritative ability to interpret the Jewish scriptures, certain aspects of their representation of this exegesis differ. To introduce my discussion of these differences, I will compare their use of a near-parallel Jesus saying. Both Luke and Justin cite the saying to highlight the importance of understanding the truth that Jesus reveals, but each contextualizes the tradition in a distinctive manner. Luke 10:21–24 describes the special revelation that Jesus mediates to his disciples as a disclosure from the Father:

Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἡγαλλιάσατο [ἐν] τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ εἶπεν, Ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις· ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου. Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τίς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὃ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.⁴⁹ Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπεν, Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ βασιλεῖς ἠθέλησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.

At that same hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit and said, “I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and the intelligent and have revealed them to infants; yes, Father, for such was your gracious will. *All things have been handed over to me by my Father; and no one knows who the Son is except the Father, or who the Father is except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.*” Then turning to the disciples, he said to them privately, “Blessed are the eyes that see what you see! For I tell you that many prophets and kings wanted to see what you see, but did not see it, and to hear what you hear, but did not hear it” [*italics mine*].
(Luke 10:21–24)

The passage follows immediately after a discussion between Jesus and the seventy, upon their return from announcing the kingdom throughout Judaea (Luke 10:17–20). After explaining how their mission affected the defeat of demonic forces, Jesus praises God for his revelation of what had long been hidden from human perception. The Jesus saying in this context thus depicts the kingdom that Jesus and his followers proclaim

⁴⁹ Compare also the slightly different version of this Jesus saying in Matt 11:27.

as the focal point of revelation,⁵⁰ and Luke presents this manifestation of the kingdom as the culmination of what the prophets had longed to see and hear.⁵¹

In *Dial.* 100.1–2, Justin places a near-parallel saying of Jesus within the context of a lengthy verse-by-verse citation and exposition of LXX Psalm 21 (*Dial.* 98–106). He cites the saying as evidence that “the gospel” affirms his conclusions about the mysterious interpretation of this psalm:

Τὸ δὲ ἀκόλουθον· Σὺ δὲ ἐν ἁγίῳ κατοικεῖς, ὁ ἔπαινος, [τοῦ] Ἰσραὴλ· ἐσήμαινεν ὅτι <τι> ἐπαίνου ἄξιον καὶ θαυμασμοῦ μέλλει ποιεῖν, μετὰ τὸ σταυρωθῆναι ἀνίστασθαι μέλλων τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν, ὃ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ λαβὼν ἔχει. Ὅτι γὰρ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ καλεῖται ὁ Χριστός, ἀπέδειξα· καὶ οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ εὐλογίᾳ καὶ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Ἰούδα τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ κεκηρύχθαι ἐν μυστηρίῳ ἀπέδειξα, <ἀλλὰ> καὶ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ δὴ γέγραπται εἰπών· Πάντα μοι παραδέδοται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ καὶ οἱς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ. Ἀπεκάλυψεν οὖν ἡμῖν πάντα ὅσα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ νενοήκαμεν, γνόντες αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον μὲν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων <όντα>, καὶ τῶν πατριαρχῶν υἱόν, ἐπειδὴ, διὰ τῆς ἀπὸ γένους αὐτῶν παρθένου σαρκοποιηθεὶς, ἄνθρωπος αἰδιῆς καὶ ἄτιμος καὶ παθητὸς ὑπέμεινε γενέσθαι.

And what follows (from the psalm), “But you dwell in a holy place, O praise of Israel” (LXX Ps 21:4), signified that he was about to do <something> worthy of praise and wonder, which he received from his Father when he rose from the dead on the third day after the crucifixion. For I have pointed out (*Dial.* 58.1–2; 91) that Christ is called both Jacob and Israel, and I have shown that not only in the blessing of Joseph and Judah have the things about him been proclaimed in a mystery, <but> also in the Gospel it is written that he said: *All things have been handed over to me by my Father; and no one knows the Father except the Son; nor the Son except the Father, and those to whom the Son might reveal him* (Matt 11:27; Luke 10:22). He thus revealed to us all things, as much as also we have understood from the scriptures by his grace, so that we know him as the First-begotten of God, as <the one who is> before all creatures, and as the Son of the patriarchs, since he assumed flesh by a

⁵⁰ As Marshall, *Luke*, 434, notes, the antecedent of “these things” (ταῦτα) in Luke 10:21 is not entirely clear. Nevertheless, the context of this passage strongly suggests that ταῦτα refers to the message and power of the kingdom (e.g., Luke 9:1–6; 10:1–12).

⁵¹ Although Matt 11:25–27 and 13:16–17 recount material parallel to Luke 10:21–22, Luke alone records the mission of the seventy and links the saying with this mission (Luke 10:17–24).

virgin of their race, and submitted to become a human without comeliness or honor, and subject to suffering [*italics mine*].
(*Dial.* 100.1–2)

Through his use of the inferential conjunction οὖν at the beginning of *Dial.* 100.2, Justin applies the Jesus saying to a revelation from the Jewish scriptures that Christ gives to his followers. As a result of this special understanding, he explains, Christ-believers are able to recognize that he is the “First-begotten” (πρωτότοκος) of God,⁵² the one who is before all creatures, and the son of the patriarchs. Within the wider context of the *Dialogue*, this statement can be understood as a reference to how the Jewish scriptures themselves provide revelation about the incarnation and pre-existence of Christ.⁵³

Both Luke and Justin indicate that knowledge from Christ is necessary for arriving at a correct understanding of the Jewish scriptures, but each emphasizes a different aspect of this revelation. Whereas Luke uses the Jesus saying to present the proclamation of the kingdom as the focal point of correct understanding, to which the ancient prophets attest, Justin uses the saying to portray the Jewish scriptures as the primary object of revelation, to which the traditions about Jesus attest.⁵⁴ In other words, Luke uses the Jewish scriptures as a lens

⁵² Note that Justin uses the term “First-begotten” (πρωτότοκος) to refer to the pre-existent Christ, or *Logos* (e.g., *1 Apol.* 23.2; 46.2; 63.15).

⁵³ In *1 Apology* 63, Justin uses a near-identical Jesus saying to draw a similar conclusion. He twice repeats the saying—“No one knows the Father except the Son, nor does anyone know the Son except the Father, and those to whom the Son will reveal him” (*1 Apol.* 63.2; cf. 63.15)—to argue that Jews have not recognized the nature of God or his Son, the *Logos*. Justin argues that since the angel identified himself as “I am who I am, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” (Ex 3:14–15; cf. *1 Apol.* 63.11), Jews wrongly assume that the “angel” who spoke with Moses was really the Father. He contends that Jews do not understand Exod 3:14–15 correctly because they do not recognize that the pre-existent Christ, the *Logos*, spoke to Moses from the burning bush. The saying in this context thus serves as an indictment of Jews for their inability to understand how the scriptures bear witness to the pre-existent *Logos*.

⁵⁴ Justin typically uses the sayings of and traditions about Jesus, which he often describes as “the memoirs of the apostles,” as historical evidence that the predictions from the Jewish scriptures had come true. For him, this material verifies the authenticity of the Jewish scriptures and serves as a hermeneutical key that unlocks their true meaning. Willis A. Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr* (London: SPCK, 1965), 23–8, notes that *Dial.* 100.1 (cited above) serves as a good example of this use of the “memoirs” in the writings of Justin. He observes that Justin uses a combination of material that parallels Matt 11:27 and Luke 10:22 to support his interpretations of LXX Ps 21:3, and proceeds “to quote from and allude to the Gospels as historical support for his interpretations of Psalm 22 in *Dial.* ci; ciii; civ; cv; cvi; and cvii” (25); cf. Helmet Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London:

through which to interpret the story of Jesus while Justin uses the story of Jesus as a lens through which to interpret the Jewish scriptures.

This difference between Luke and Justin can be attributed, in part, to the different genres in which they write. In his preface, Luke indicates that he aims to record the story of Jesus and the birth of the Jesus movement, and to present its inception and growth as the fulfillment of ancient promises (Luke 1:1–4). Naturally, this type of account leads him to portray the words and actions of the characters within his story as the primary focus of revelation, while the Jewish scriptures serve as a framework, or lens, for interpreting the events that he narrates.⁵⁵ By way of contrast, Justin's *Apologies* are set in the form of an address to the emperor, and his *Dialogue with Trypho* purports to recount his conversation with the Jew Trypho in the guise of a lively debate. In both of these settings, Justin seeks to demonstrate the truth and legitimacy of Christianity through argumentation from the Jewish scriptures.⁵⁶ The Jewish scriptures thus serve as the logical object of his discourse, while the traditions and sayings of Jesus function as an interpretive lens through which to read the Jewish scriptures properly.

Yet this variation between Luke and Justin can also be explained, in part, by considering important distinctions between the way that they depict Christ as the authoritative source for understanding the Jewish scriptures correctly. Among the various approaches that Second Temple Jewish interpreters use to present their exegesis as authoritative, two overlapping strategies are particularly relevant to our dis-

SCM, 1990), 41–2; Henry Chadwick, “Justin Martyr’s Defense of Christianity,” *BJRL* 47 (1964–1965): 283; Craig D. Allert, *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Trypho* (VCSup 64; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 98–102.

⁵⁵ A number of studies note and describe this tendency of Luke to use the Jewish scriptures to interpret the events that he narrates. For example, Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (JSNTSup 12; JSOT Press, 1987), 274, concludes that Luke’s approach to the Jewish scriptures is best described as “proclamation from prophecy and pattern” because “Luke sees the Scripture fulfilled in Jesus in terms of the fulfillment of the OT prophecy and in terms of the reintroduction and fulfillment of the OT patterns that point to the presence of God’s saving work” (274). As noted in the introduction, the recent studies of Denova, Pao, and Litwak also demonstrate the way in which Luke uses scriptural themes to provide a framework for the events he narrates.

⁵⁶ A central part of the argument in the *Apologies* involves citing and expounding the Jewish scriptures to persuade the audience of the antiquity and authenticity of the Christ-believing group (see *1 Apology* 30–53). Also, from *Dialogue* 10 onward, Justin records a debate that centers upon the exegesis of the Jewish scriptures.

cussion of this difference between Luke and Justin. First, as noted in Chapter One, rival Jewish groups often asserted that they possessed an exclusive understanding of the Jewish scriptures, in part, because they had access to a privileged form of knowledge that helped them unlock the true meaning of the scriptures.⁵⁷ Second, as Jassen observes, some interpreters attempt to configure lines of continuity between the ancient prophets and their exegesis in order to present the latter as the proper continuation of the former.⁵⁸ Luke and Justin use strategies that are similar to each other insofar as both assert that Christ-believers possess a divine enablement and special instruction to understand the scriptures correctly. Nevertheless, they do not present the privileged knowledge that Christ gives in precisely the same way, nor do they show how he provides continuity between the message of the ancient prophets and the exegesis of Christ-believers identically.

2.4.1 Luke: “The Word of the Lord”

Besides illustrating how the events of his narrative represent the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures, Luke makes a concerted effort to present the story of Jesus as an extension of the biblical past by saturating his narrative with biblical language, themes, and models so that it reads as a continuation of the biblical story.⁵⁹ Numerous examples demonstrate

⁵⁷ As Carol A. Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 67–9, observes, certain Jewish groups in the Second Temple period maintained that correct interpretation of the scriptures required the possession of other privileged knowledge. See also Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 41–68, 74–98. For further discussion, see Chapter One.

⁵⁸ For example, the Qumran group attempts to depict ancient prophets as mediators of legislative revelation, and to draw lines of continuity between this activity and their own exegesis and legislative activities. According to Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 331–42, “The deliberate alignment of the community’s legislative program with the similar activity of the ancient prophets is intended to identify the sectarian system of lawgiving as a contemporary realization of classical prophets” (333). See also Jassen’s discussion of 1QS 5:8–12; 8:15–16.

⁵⁹ As W. Ward Gasque, “A Fruitful Field: Recent Study of the Acts of the Apostles,” *Int* 42 (1988): 120, notes, this emphasis in Luke-Acts is widely recognized. See, e.g., Nils Dahl, *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976), 87–8; Drury, *Tradition and Design*, 3–8; Joel B. Green, “The Problem of a Beginning: Israel’s Scriptures in Luke 1–2,” *BBR* 4 (1994): 457–72; Rebecca I. Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 14; Sheffield: SAP, 1997), 26.

how Luke envisages this type of continuity,⁶⁰ but his emphasis upon the prophetic identity and message of Jesus is particularly relevant to my study because of the way that it sheds light upon Luke's configuration of the continuity between ancient prophecy and the inspired exegesis of Christ-believers.⁶¹

In a more marked way than Matthew or Mark, Luke emphasizes the role of Jesus as a prophet,⁶² and depicts his followers as divinely-inspired messengers who also carry out his prophetic mission. In continuation with the prophetic ministry of John the Baptist and the prophets to Israel that preceded him, Jesus acts as a Spirit-anointed herald who is "mighty in word and deed" (Luke 24:19).⁶³ At times, Luke parallels the activities of Jesus with those of prophets such as Elijah and Elisha, or likens him to "one of the ancient prophets" (Luke 4:25–27; 7:11–17,

⁶⁰ For example, in the opening chapters of Luke and Acts, we read the announcements of the dawning of a new day for God's people, the Jews: Israel's victory over its enemies (Luke 1:46–55, 67–79); the coming experience of consolation, salvation, and glory for Israel (Luke 2:25–32); the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit; and the signs and wonders of the last days (Acts 2–5). As Augustin George, "Israel dans L'œuvre de Luc" *RB* 75 (1968): 488, observes, Luke portrays the coming of Jesus in Luke 1–2 as a renewal of ancient days of Israel: "Au moment où le Nouveau Testament apparaît dans la person de Jésus, Israël est encore dans le temps de L'Ancien Testament."

⁶¹ Of course, Luke also portrays Jesus as more than a prophet. In his infancy stories, for example, he identifies Jesus as the Davidic Messiah and servant that Isaiah foretells (Luke 1:69; 2:26, 30–32; cf. 2:11). Luke also presents Jesus as "Son of the Most High" (Luke 1:35), "Son of God" (Luke 1:35; cf. 3:22; 9:35), and as a messianic agent of deliverance (Luke 4:16–21). Note also the confession of Peter in Luke 9:20: "You are the Messiah of God."

⁶² Luke includes three Markan references to the popular opinion that Jesus was a prophet (compare Luke 9:8 and Mark 6:15; Luke 9:19 and Mark 8:28 [cf. Matt 16:14]; Luke 22:64 and Mark 14:65 [cf. Matt 26:68]), but also develops this theme further than do the other synoptic accounts.

⁶³ By contrast, Conzelmann, *Luke*, 23–5, 101–3, 160–1, argues that Luke 16:16–17 describes the end of the epoch of the Law and the prophets and the beginning of a new era in salvation history. In Conzelmann's view, Luke presents John the Baptist as the last of the prophets of Israel and Jesus as the inaugurator of a new stage in redemptive history. Certainly, Luke 16:16 sets Jesus and his message apart from all who have preceded him but this should not be taken as a negation of his role as a prophet who stood within the traditions of Israel. Although Luke makes clear that Jesus announces and inaugurates a new era of God's salvation, he also presents Jesus as a prophet to Israel (e.g., Luke 4:24, 27; 7:16; 9:8; 13:33; 24:19; Acts 2:22; 3:22–23; 7:37). For further discussion, see, e.g., Marshall, *Luke*, 124–128; F. Schneider, *Jesus der Prophet* (OBO 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), 89–190; P. S. Minear, *To Heal and to Reveal: The Prophetic Vocation According to Luke* (New York: Seabury, 1976), 69, 102–21; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (Missoula: Scholars, 1977), 29–126; David P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 46–79.

51–56, 57–62; 9:7–9, 19) whereas, in other contexts, he portrays Jesus as a prophet like Moses (Acts 3:22–23; 7:22–53; cf. Luke 9:28–36).⁶⁴ The disciples of Jesus also engage in this prophetic ministry. Like Jesus, they receive the empowerment of the Spirit, proclaim the message of God, and perform the signs and wonders that were associated with activities of ancient prophets.⁶⁵ Furthermore, through his use of the phrases “the word of God” (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ) and “the word of the Lord” (ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου), Luke presents the proclamation of Jesus and his followers as analogous to the message of the ancient prophets who spoke to the people of Israel on behalf of God.⁶⁶ The inclusion of the genitive qualifiers τοῦ θεοῦ or τοῦ κυρίου clarify that God is

⁶⁴ For further discussion of the links between Luke-Acts and the Elijah-Elisha narratives, see R. A. Hammer, “Elijah and Jesus: A Quest for Identity,” *Judaism* 19 (1970): 207–18; R. E. Brown, “Jesus and Elijah,” *Perspective* 12 (1971): 85–104; Thomas L. Brodie, *The Crucial Bridge: The Elijah-Elisha Narrative as an Interpretive Synthesis of Genesis-Kings and a Literary Model for the Gospels* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 82–5. For descriptions of the portrayal of Jesus as a prophet like Moses in Luke-Acts, see Minear, *To Heal and Reveal*, 102–21; Johnson, *Literary Function*, 70–7; Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet*, 46–79.

⁶⁵ Empowerment from the Spirit (Jesus—e.g., Luke 3:22; 4:1, 14, 18; Acts 10:38; disciples—e.g., Acts 4:8; 5:32; 6:3; 7:55; 11:24; 13:9), proclamation of the message of God (Jesus—e.g., Luke 4:16–30, 31–36; 5:1; 6:17–49; 8:9–21; cf. Acts 10:36; disciples—e.g., Acts 4:13, 29, 31; 5:42; 8:4, 12, 25, 40; 11:20; 13:5, 32, 46; 14:7; 15:35; 28:31), and performance of signs and wonders (Jesus—e.g., Luke 4:38–41; 5:12–16; 6:6–11; 7:1–10, 11–16; cf. Acts 2:22; 10:38; disciples—e.g., Acts 3:1–11; 4:30; 5:12–16; 6:8; 8:6; 14:3; 15:12). Like the message of Jesus, the preaching of the disciples also evokes responses of acceptance or rejection among the people (Jesus—e.g., Luke 4:16–30; 12:49–53; 13:33–34; disciples—e.g., Acts 4:1–22; 5:17–42; 6:8–14; 7:54–60; 13:42–52; 17:1–9; 18:1–6; 28:23–28). Johnson, *Literary Function*, 59, asserts that Luke deliberately portrays the Twelve, the Seven, and Paul and Barnabas, as prophets; cf. Leo O’Reilly, *Word and Sign in the Acts of the Apostles: A Study in Lucan Theology* (AnGreg 243; Rome: Editrice Pontifica Universita Gregoriana, 1987), 182–5; David P. Moessner, “‘The Christ Must Suffer’: New Light on the Jesus—Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts,” *NovT* 28 (1986): 255; Minear, *To Heal and Reveal*, 123; Richard J. Dillon, “The Prophecy of Christ and His Witnesses According to the Discourses of Acts,” *NTS* 32 (1986): 546.

⁶⁶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ—Luke 5:1; 8:11, 21; 11:28; Acts 4:31; 6:2, 7; 8:14; 11:1; 12:24; 13:5, 7, 46, 48; 16:32; 17:13; 18:11; 19:20; ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου—Acts 8:25; 13:44, 46, 49; 15:35, 36; 16:32; 19:10; 20:35. See also Acts 10:36—τὸν λόγον [ὄν] ἀπέστειλεν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ. The LXX uses similar terminology to refer to the messages from God that are given to and spoken by a prophet: λόγος κυρίου—2 Sam 12:9; 24:11; 1 Kgdms 15:24; 2 Kgdms 12:9; 14:17; 23:2; 24:11; 3 Kgdms 12:22, 24; 13:20; 16:1; 4 Kgdms 7:1; 9:36; 15:12; 20:16, 19; 24:2; 1 Chron 10:13; 11:3, 10; 12:24; 17:3; 22:8; 2 Chron 11:2; 12:7; 18:18; 35:6; 36:5, 21; Hos 1:1, 2; 4:1; Amos 5:1; 7:16; 8:11–12; Mic 1:1; 4:2; 6:1; Joel 1:1; Jon 1:1; 3:1; Zeph 1:1; 2:5; Hag 1:1, 3; 2:10, 20; Zech 1:1, 7; 4:6, 8; 6:9; 7:1, 4, 8; 8:1, 18; 9:1; 11:11; 12:1; Mal 1:1; Isa 2:1, 3; 28:14; 38:4; 39:5, 8; Dan 9:2; and numerous instances throughout Jeremiah (59 times) and Ezekiel (60 times); λόγος θεοῦ, λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ—Jud 3:20; 1 Chron 25:5; Jer 1:2; 9:19.

the source of their proclamation.⁶⁷ Within Israel's prophetic tradition, then, Luke depicts Jesus and his followers as appointed delegates of God who, in continuity with the prophets of old, communicate his word to the people.

It is this prophetic message from God, moreover, which functions as the vehicle for proclaiming the correct interpretation of the Jewish scriptures.⁶⁸ As such, it provides the proper perspective, or privileged revelatory knowledge, required to understand the Jewish scriptures correctly. Indeed, Luke rarely presents scriptural citation and

⁶⁷ Whether we read τοῦ θεοῦ as a subjective genitive (e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:565) or as a genitive of source (e.g., Bock, *Luke*, 1:453), the addition of τοῦ θεοῦ to ὁ λόγος highlights that God is the originator of the message. As Claus-Peter März, *Das Wort Gottes bei Lukas: Die lukanische Worttheologie als Frage an die neuere Lukasforschung* (ETS 11; Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1974), 9–11, argues, the phrases ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου and ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ have the effect of emphasizing that the message originates not from humans but from God. Bovon, *Luke*, 168, argues that the phrase “word of God” highlights the role of Jesus as a delegate of God. The only other two instances of the phrase “the word of God” in the gospels occur in Mark 7:13 and Matt 15:6. In these two cases, the phrase clearly refers to a particular commandment in the Jewish scriptures. Scholars often interpret Luke's use of the phrase “the word of God” as a reference to the *kerygma* of Jesus and the apostles in Luke-Acts; see, e.g., Marshall, *Luke*, 323–4; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:711; Johnson, *Luke*, 133–4; Bock, *Acts*, 264; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:316. According to Bovon, *Luke*, 168–9, the phrase refers to the proclamation of Jesus in Luke (5:1; 8:11, 21; 11:28) and to the post-Easter kerygma in Acts (4:31; 6:2, 7; 8:14; 11:1; 13:5, 7, 44, 46, 48; 16:32; 17:13; 18:11). Within the context of Luke-Acts, as we have seen, scriptural interpretation forms a central part of this proclamation.

⁶⁸ Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 161–7, argues that Luke hypostatizes “the word of God” and portrays it as an instrument of conquest in the travel narratives in Acts. In his view, the three summary descriptions of the growth of “the word of God” in Acts 6:7, 12:24, and 19:20 further this argument because ὁ λόγος appears as the subject of the verb αὐξάνω. Similarly, Daniel Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian: Writing the 'Acts of the Apostles'* (SNTSMS 121; trans. Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery and Richard Bauckham; Cambridge: CUP, 2002), 37–8, argues that the foundation of Luke's use of λόγος-terminology is Christological and maintains that Luke portrays “the Word” as an entity that “grows” (Acts 6:7; 12:24; 19:20), spreads throughout the region (Acts 13:49), is received (Acts 2:41; 8:14; 11:1; 17:11), praised (Acts 13:48), and possesses its messengers (Acts 18:5). März, *Das Wort Gottes bei Lukas*, 12–3, also maintains that Luke presents ὁ λόγος as a hypostatic entity and suggests that this use of ὁ λόγος originates from the presentation of דבר יהוה in the Hebrew bible (e.g., Ps 107:20). As Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:82, rightly notes, however, Acts 6:7, 12:24, and 19:20 function as summary descriptions that show the continuing influence of Luke 8:4–15, and represent a *metaphor* that serves as a vehicle for understanding the vitality of the word: “It is not just a human report of God's activities but the way in which God continues to act in fulfilling his divine purpose” (82). This description highlights what Pao and others have misinterpreted. Acts 6:7, 12:24, and 19:20 function metaphorically to portray the vitality of the Christian message rather than to present the “word of God” as a hypostatic agent.

interpretation outside of this framework.⁶⁹ In the opening chapters of his gospel, for instance, he places prophetic announcements of the coming of Christ upon the lips of angels, Mary, a priest, and a prophet (Luke 1:13–17, 26–38, 46–55, 67–80; 2:29–35). Notably, each of these predictions contains a description of how John the Baptist or Jesus would fulfill the scriptures. Similarly, Luke often presents the message of Jesus as a prophetic discourse that includes an exposition of how the Jewish scriptures ought to be interpreted or applied.⁷⁰ In Acts, Luke extends this theme by portraying the followers of Jesus as messengers who continue his prophetic mission, and the substance of their message as the proclamation of how Jesus fulfills the Jewish scriptures.⁷¹ Luke thus presents the preaching of Jesus and his followers as a type of prophetic message that supplies the explanation required to understand the Jewish scriptures properly. Correct exegesis occurs as a part of this inspired preaching, and Luke presents such messages as analogous to the revelation that the ancient prophets received.

The account of the first sermon of Jesus in Luke 4 represents a particularly important example of how Luke depicts Jesus as both prophet and exegete of the Jewish scriptures.⁷² On the Sabbath day, the Lukan Jesus enters the synagogue and reads from the Isaiah scroll (Luke 4:16–20). After citing a combination of Isa 61:1–2 and 58:6b, Jesus provides an explanation of these passages that serves to announce his mission to Israel: “Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing” (Luke 4:21).⁷³ When the Nazareth crowd expresses wonder

⁶⁹ The only two clear exceptions are Luke 3:4–6 and 19:38. Although Acts 1:15–26 and 15:15–17 may not be considered as part of the prophetic message of Jesus that his followers continue, they could be interpreted as instances of Spirit-inspired scriptural interpretation.

⁷⁰ Luke 4:16–27; 6:1–5; 7:26–30; 8:9–10; 10:25–37; 11:29–32, 51; 13:29–30, 35; 18:18–25, 31–34; 19:41–46; 20:9–19, 20–25, 27–40, 41–44; 21:5–33; 22:35–38, 69; 23:28–31; 24:25–27, 44–49.

⁷¹ Acts 2:14–40; 3:11–26; 4:8–12; 7:1–53; 8:26–40; 10:34–43; 13:13–52; 17:1–3, 10–12; 18:1–6; 19:8–10; 26:19–23; 28:23–28.

⁷² For further discussion of Luke 4:16–30, see Chapter Five.

⁷³ Scholars frequently debate whether Luke 4:18 refers to a messianic or prophetic anointing of Jesus. Proponents of the former view include Alfred A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1922), 121; Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York: MacMillan, 1927), 276–7; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 229; Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (SNT 1; Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1969), 148; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:58. Proponents of the latter view include Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:532; John Nolland, *Luke* (WBC 35; 3 vols.; Dallas: Word, 1989–1993), 1:196; Johnson, *Luke*, 81; J. Severino Croatto, “Jesus,

at this announcement (Luke 4:22–23), Jesus declares that “no prophet is accepted in the prophet’s hometown” (Luke 4:24) and appeals to scriptural stories about Elijah and Elisha to describe how his ministry will benefit outsiders (Luke 4:24–27; cf. 1 Kgs 17:8–24; 2 Kgs 5:1–19). Although the references to these ancient prophets help to explain why Jesus would not meet the expectations of his audience, the recollection of such figures also highlights the way that Luke draws a line of continuity between the ministry of Jesus and theirs.⁷⁴ Luke fuses the identity of Jesus as prophet with his role as an inspired exegete of the Jewish scriptures: as a Spirit-anointed prophet to Israel, Jesus reads from the Jewish scriptures and proclaims how he will fulfill them.⁷⁵

An excerpt from the sermon of Peter in Acts 3:12–26 provides a cogent example of the way that Luke also portrays the preaching of the followers of Jesus as a continuation of the message of Jesus:

καὶ νῦν, ἀδελφοί, οἶδα ὅτι κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν· ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἃ προκατήγγειλεν διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτοῦ, ἐπλήρωσεν οὕτως. μετανοήσατε οὖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε εἰς τὸ ἐξαλειφθῆναι ὑμῶν τὰς ἀμαρτίας... Μωϋσῆς μὲν εἶπεν ὅτι Προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ· αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε κατὰ πάντα ὅσα ἂν λαλήσῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. ἔσται δὲ πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἥτις ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ. καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ προφῆται ἀπὸ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν καὶ κατήγγειλαν τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας. ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῆς διαθήκης ἧς διέθετο ὁ θεὸς πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν λέγων πρὸς Ἀβραάμ, Καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου [ἐν]ευλογηθήσονται πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς. ὑμῖν πρῶτον ἀναστήσας

Prophet like Elijah, and Prophet-Teacher like Moses in Luke-Acts,” *JBL* 124 (2005): 455. David Miller, “Luke’s Conception of Prophets Considered in the Context of Second Temple Literature” (PhD diss., McMaster University, 2004), 104, 112–5, correctly points out that the categories of prophet and Messiah in Luke-Acts need not be mutually exclusive; cf. Bovon, *Luke*, 154. Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness* (JPTS 9; Sheffield: SAP, 1996), 234–6, also offers a helpful mediating position by arguing that “Luke’s eschatology... suggests that he understands Jesus as the messianic prophet” (235).

⁷⁴ See, e.g., Robert L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* (SBL 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 6–27; Denova, *Things Accomplished*, 138–9, 149; B. J. Koet, *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 50–2.

⁷⁵ Notably, prophetic and exegetical activities are similarly intertwined in certain early Jewish texts and in the Hebrew Bible. For example, the Chronicler presents the inspired speech of the prophetic figure, Azariah, as scriptural interpretation (2 Chron 15:1–8) and Ezra 7:6–10 depicts scriptural instruction of Ezra as divinely inspired activity analogous to prophetic revelation. For further discussion, see Chapter One.

ὁ θεὸς τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εὐλογοῦντα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν ἕκαστον ἀπὸ τῶν πονηριῶν ὑμῶν.

And now, friends, I know that you acted in ignorance, as did also your rulers. But what God announced beforehand through the mouth of all the prophets, that his Messiah would suffer, he thus fulfilled. Repent therefore, and turn so that your sins may be wiped out.... Moses said, "The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from your own people. You must listen to whatever he tells you. And it will be that every person who does not listen to that prophet will be destroyed from the people" (Deut 18:15–16a, 19 and Lev 23:29). And all the prophets, as many as have spoken, from Samuel and those after, also proclaimed these days. You are the descendants of the prophets and of the covenant that God gave to your ancestors, saying to Abraham, "And in your offspring all the families of the earth shall be blessed." When God raised up his servant, he sent him first to you, to bless you by turning each of you from your wicked ways. (Acts 3:17–26)

Here the Lukan Peter cites a combination of Deut 18:15–16a, 19 and Lev 23:29,⁷⁶ and interprets these passages as a prediction about Christ. According to Peter, these passages point to an end-time figure whom "all the prophets" had anticipated and whom God raised up to bless Israel at the very time when Peter was delivering his message to fellow-Jews (i.e., in "these days"). How did Jesus continue to bless Israel in "these days"?⁷⁷ If we take the verb ἀνίστημι to refer to the resurrection of Jesus, then it is possible that Luke wishes to indicate that the risen Jesus effected blessing and repentance by speaking through the message of Peter.⁷⁸ Alternatively, we could interpret ἀνίστημι as a reference to

⁷⁶ In Acts 3:22, Peter cites Deut 18:15 but changes the second-person pronouns from singular (σοι, σου) to plural (ὑμῖν, ὑμῶν) to address his audience more directly. The addition of ὅσα ἂν λαλήσῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς to the end of the citation in Acts 3:22 recalls ὅσα ἐὰν λαλήσῃ from Deut 18:19. After the citation, Acts 3:22 has an additional πρὸς ὑμᾶς, which again draws attention to the audience of Peter and their need to respond to his message. For further discussion of these adaptations, see Rese, *Alttestamentliche*, 66–67; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:207–9; Bock, *Acts*, 178–9.

⁷⁷ As Miller, "Luke's Conception of Prophets," 248, suggests, "these days" probably include the messianic activities of Jesus and the period of the early church; cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:210–1, who argues that the phrase "these days" refers to "the times just spoken of, the last days, of which the events of resurrection, ascension, and the gift of the Spirit mark the first" (211).

⁷⁸ A number of scholars interpret ἀνίστημι in Acts 3:22 and 3:26 as references to the resurrection of Christ and argue that Luke presents the risen Jesus as the prophet like Moses who calls Israel to repentance through his disciples. See, e.g., Robert F. O'Toole, *The Christological Climax of Paul's Defense* (Ac 22:1–26:32) (AnBib 78; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978), 119; idem, "Activity of the Risen Jesus in Luke-

the appointment of Jesus as a prophet who called Israel to repentance during his earthly ministry.⁷⁹ In either case, the sermon of Peter functions as an extension of the call to repentance that Jesus initiated during his earthly ministry. As Jesus preached repentance to Israel, so Peter, one of his appointed delegates, continues this message by calling his compatriots to repent.⁸⁰ Luke thus portrays Jesus as the eschatological prophet that Moses foretold and, in turn, shows the authority of the message of Peter by presenting it as an extension of the prophetic message that Jesus proclaimed.⁸¹

As one who continues the message of Jesus, the prophet like Moses, Peter conveys a revolutionary understanding of the Jewish scriptures that aims to correct previous misunderstanding.⁸² In Acts 3:15–18, Peter indicates that he knows that the Jerusalem Jews acted in ignorance when they killed Jesus and therefore inadvertently fulfilled what the prophets had predicted about him. The explanation implies that, had they understood the Jewish scriptures correctly, they would not have acted in this way (cf. Acts 13:27). Subsequently, in Acts 3:19–24, Peter calls the Jerusalem Jews to repent from this blindness and to

Acts,” *Bib* 62 (1981): 480, 496; Dennis Hamm, “Acts 3:12–26: Peter’s Speech and the Healing of the Man Born lame,” *PRS* 11 (1984): 212–3; Jacques Dupont, “Les discours de Pierre dans les Actes et le chapitre 24 de l’évangile de Luc,” in *Évangile de Luc: Problèmes littéraires et théologiques* (BETL 32; Belgium: Peeters, 1973), 353; Dillon, “Prophecy,” 544–9; O’Reilly, *Word and Sign*, 114–9; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:56; Croatto, “Prophet-Teacher,” 460.

⁷⁹ Miller, “Luke’s Conception of Prophets,” 257. Johnson, *Literary Function*, 66–7, argues that ἀνίστημι refers to the raising up of Jesus as a prophet during his earthly ministry but maintains that ἀνίστημι also recalls his resurrection, at which time God raised him up as the definitive and eschatological prophet.

⁸⁰ For a discussion of the role of Peter as an eschatological prophet who proclaims repentance to Israel, see Hans F. Bayer, “The Preaching of Peter in Acts” in *Witness to the Gospel*, 262–7; cf. David P. Moessner, “Paul in Acts: Preacher of Eschatological Repentance to Israel,” *NTS* 34 (1988): 101–3.

⁸¹ As John T. Carroll, *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts* (SBL Dissertation Series 92; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 137–8, 148, 160–1, notes, both Jesus and his disciples fulfill the same mandate: “Whoever listens to you listens to me, and whoever rejects you rejects me, and whoever rejects me rejects the one who sent me” (Luke 10:16). Therefore, even if ἀνίστημι in Acts 3:22 and 3:26 does not refer to the resurrection, the context of Acts 2–3 suggests that the exhortation to listen to Jesus and his message in Acts 3:22–23 should be taken as the equivalent of a command to hear and heed the preaching of his followers who speak as his representatives. For further discussion of the parallels that Luke draws between Jesus and the disciples, and his presentation of the message and ministry of the disciples as an extension of the message and ministry of Jesus, see Johnson, *Literary Function*, 38–69.

⁸² Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:57.

recognize Jesus as the prophet predicted by Moses; that is, Peter exhorts them to understand how Jesus fulfilled the Jewish scriptures in “these days,” to respond appropriately to this realization, and to receive the promised blessing through him (Acts 3:24–26). Peter’s exegesis thus stands in continuity with the message of Jesus, the prophet like Moses, and reorients the Jewish people to a proper understanding of their scriptures.

The story of the Ethiopian further exemplifies Luke’s configuration of a connection between the exegesis of Christ-believers and the message and activities of the ancient prophets of Israel (Acts 8:26–40). In this episode, Luke draws parallels between the actions of Philip and those of Elijah (1 Kings 17–18). Like Elijah, Philip receives divine instructions to go to a desert setting (Acts 8:26; cf. 1 Kgs 18:2, 5), hears the command to “rise and go” (Acts 8:26; cf. 1 Kgs 17:9), runs alongside a chariot (Acts 8:30; cf. 1 Kgs 18:46), and is snatched away by the Spirit (Acts 8:39; cf. 1 Kgs 18:12).⁸³ Luke thus depicts Philip as a type of prophetic emissary who resembles the prophet Elijah. In his role as inspired messenger of the Lord, moreover, Philip unveils the true meaning of the Jewish scriptures to the Ethiopian.

The episodes in Luke 4 (Jesus), Acts 3 (Peter), and Acts 8 (Philip) serve as but a few examples of how Luke presents the exegesis of Christ-believers as part of a prophetic word from God. They illustrate that, for Luke, the divinely-inspired exegesis of Christ-believers stands in continuity with the words of the ancient prophets. Furthermore, Luke presents this proclamation of Christ-believers as the source of revelatory knowledge that enables one to hear and understand the Jewish scriptures correctly. Given this emphasis, it is not surprising that Luke presents the message of Jesus and his followers, together with their exegesis of the Jewish scriptures, as the focal point of revelation from God (Luke 10:22–24).

⁸³ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:108. Some commentators suggest that Luke portrays Philip as an Elijah figure in order to draw a parallel between Philip’s encounter with Simon and Elijah’s defeat of the prophets of Baal in 1 Kings 18. See, e.g., Spencer, *Philip in Acts*, 136; cf. Étienne Trocmé, *Le “Livre des Actes” et l’histoire* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1957), 180. For further discussion of the parallels between Philip and the prophet Elijah, see Bruce, *Acts*, 225; T. L. Brodie, “Towards Unraveling the Rhetorical Sources in Acts: 2 Kings 5 as One Component of Acts 8, 9–40,” *Bib* 67 (1986): 41–67; Spencer, *Philip in Acts*, 135–41; Rick Strelan, “The Running Prophet (Acts 8:30),” *NovT* 43 (2001): 32–3.

2.4.2 *Justin: The Logos*

Although Justin recognizes that Jesus was empowered by the Spirit and engaged in the activities of a prophet, he does not emphasize these aspects of the ministry of Jesus nor does he typically use phrases such as ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ or ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου to refer to his message.⁸⁴ Rather, in both the *Dialogue* and the *Apologies*, Justin frequently uses λόγος-terminology to depict Christ as a pre-existent figure who mediates revelation from God.⁸⁵ According to Justin, the *Logos* functions as a messenger who communicates the mind and will of the transcendent God.⁸⁶ In his pre-existent state, he provided revelatory knowledge about God for the patriarchs by appearing to them in the theophanies recorded in the Jewish scriptures (e.g., *Dialogue* 48; 56–64; 75; 86; 113; 126–129), and revealing to them “the discourses of the Father” (*Dial.* 128.4).⁸⁷ Therefore, the Jewish scriptures do not simply foretell Christ; they also provide a record of how he acted as the pre-existent *Logos*

⁸⁴ Although Justin uses the phrases τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον (*1 Apol.* 39.3) and τὸν λόγον (*Dial.* 109.1) to refer to the message of the apostles, this terminology appears to emerge from his dependence upon Isa 2:3–4 and Mic 4:1–7. Furthermore, Justin elsewhere attempts to demonstrate the discontinuity between the activities of Jesus and his followers and those of prophets to Israel. In *Dialogue* 87–88, for example, he acknowledges that Jesus possessed the Spirit and prophetic gifts but argues that he did not need them since he existed as God before he became incarnate (cf. *Dial.* 49.3; 51.1).

⁸⁵ Justin uses λόγος to refer to the pre-existent Christ but he also uses several other appellations for this figure, including the following: ἄγγελος (e.g., *1 Apol.* 63.5; *Dial.* 56.4); πρωτότοκος (e.g., *1 Apol.* 63.15; *Dial.* 100.2; 129.4; 138.2); Ἀρχή (e.g., *Dial.* 61.1; 62.4). For a discussion of these and other titles that Justin applies to the pre-existent Christ, see Goodenough, *Justin Martyr*, 163–75.

⁸⁶ For Justin, God does not make himself visible on the earth but dwells in the “super-celestial realms” (τὰ ὑπὲρ οὐρανὸν ἅπαντα; *Dial.* 60.2) and cannot be contained in any place within the created universe (*Dial.* 127.1–3). For this reason, God sent the pre-existent *Logos* to mediate his mind and will on earth (*Dial.* 127.3–5).

⁸⁷ Justin’s writings are the earliest known to interpret the theophanies described in the Jewish scriptures as appearances of the pre-existent Christ. Although Philo also identifies the mediator of revelation in these theophanies as the *Logos*, he does not, of course, identify this entity as Christ (compare the account of the theophanies to Abraham at Mamre and Sodom in *Dialogue* 56 [cf. 126] with Philo’s *Mut.* 15 and *Leg.* 3.217–219; to Jacob in *Dialogue* 58 with Philo’s *Som.* I. 228–230; and to Moses in *1 Apology* 62–63; *Dialogue* 59–60 with Philo’s *Mos.* 1.66). Furthermore, as Demetrius C. Trakatellis, *The Pre-Existence of Christ in Justin Martyr* (HDR 6; Missoula: Scholars, 1976), 85, notes, the descriptions of these theophanies in the writings of Philo and Justin differ insofar as Philo attempts to provide an explanation for the theophanies themselves whereas Justin does not try to explain them as much as use them as scriptural evidence for the pre-existence of Christ.

within biblical history.⁸⁸ Consequently, those who wish to understand the Jewish scriptures properly must recognize Christ as the *Logos* and comprehend how these ancient texts attest to his pre-existent activities (e.g., *1 Apol.* 63.10–16; *Dial.* 100.1–2).⁸⁹

Justin also uses the concept of Christ as the pre-existent *Logos* to show the continuity between the exegesis of Christ-believers and the Jewish scriptures. To draw this connection, he explains that the *Logos* was the source of inspiration for the initial composition of these sacred texts (e.g., *1 Apol.* 36.1–2; *2 Apol.* 10.7–8),⁹⁰ and that the same *Logos* also disclosed their true meaning after his incarnation (e.g., *1 Apol.* 23.2–3; 33.1–6; 63.1–17).⁹¹ *Dialogue* 98–106 provides a lengthy

⁸⁸ Trakatellis, *Pre-Existence*, 48–9, 91–2. Several passages also mention his existence prior to creation and his incarnation in the same context (*1 Apol.* 21.1; 23.1; *Dial.* 48.1–3; 87.2; 105.3) or assume the incarnation when discussing his pre-creational existence (*Dial.* 61.1; 62.4; 129.4). Justin also indicates that Christ existed before and participated in creation (e.g., *1 Apol.* 64.5; *2 Apol.* 6.1–3; *Dialogue* 61–2). Notably, the concept of the *Logos* as an agent in the act of creation is also present in the LXX (e.g., Gen 1:3, 6, 9; Ps 33:6). See also the anthropomorphic representation of wisdom in Proverbs 8.

⁸⁹ Justin also frequently discusses the way that scripture contains typological or allegorical references to Christ (e.g., *Dialogue* 41–42; 75; 90–91; 97; 111–115; 132; 134; 140), but I will confine my discussion to his references to the activity of Christ as the pre-existent *Logos*. It should be noted, moreover, that these categories are not mutually exclusive for Justin. For example, he can describe how LXX Psalm 21 refers to the passion of Christ in a mystical parable (*Dial.* 97.3) but also explain how the pre-existent Christ inspired the words of this psalm (e.g., *Dial.* 101.1–3). Similarly, in *Dial.* 75.1, Justin argues that Moses spoke cryptically of Jesus in Exod 23:20–21, but maintains that this reference to Jesus depicts his pre-existent state when he appeared to Joshua. Again, in *Dialogue* 113–114, Justin indicates that scripture describes Christ in hidden ways, but argues that these hidden references disclose information about his pre-existent and incarnate appearances by using figurative language. Justin also asserts that there are other forms of knowledge required to understand the Jewish scriptures correctly (e.g., knowledge of the two advents of Christ [*1 Apol.* 52.3; *Dial.* 14.8; 32.2; 36.1; 40.4; 45.4; 49.2, 7–8; 51.2; 52.1, 4; 110.2, 5; 111.1; 118.2; 121.3]; the possession of an authentic translation of the LXX [*1 Apol.* 31.2–5; *Dial.* 68.7; 71.1; 120.5]), but such forms of knowledge do not occupy as prominent a place as his doctrine of the *Logos* nor does Justin use them to provide a framework for explaining the continuity between the exegesis of Christ-believers and the revelation found in the Jewish scriptures.

⁹⁰ In *1 Apol.* 38.1, Justin also attributes the inspiration for prophecy to the Holy Spirit.

⁹¹ *1 Apol.* 33.1–6 especially demonstrates Justin's understanding of the close relationship between the incarnate *Logos* and inspiration of the Jewish scriptures because it interweaves the description of the prophetic prediction of the incarnation and the assertion that the scriptures themselves were inspired by the divine *Logos*. As Trakatellis, *Pre-Existence*, 48–9, notes, Justin also links the pre-creation existence of Christ with his incarnation. Several passages mention these two states in the same

exegesis of LXX Psalm 21 that illustrates how Justin configures this type of continuity. In the process of interpreting LXX Psalm 21, Justin moves almost seamlessly between his descriptions of the pre-existent and incarnate Christ:

Τὰ δὲ ἀκόλουθα τοῦ ψαλμοῦ ταῦτα ἐν οἷς λέγει· Ἐπὶ σοὶ ἤλπισαν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, ἤλπισαν καὶ ἐρρύσω αὐτούς· πρὸς σὲ ἐκέκραζαν <καὶ ἐσώθησαν, ἐπὶ σοὶ ἤλπισαν> καὶ οὐ κατησχύνθησαν. Ἐγὼ δὲ εἰμι σκώληξ καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, ὄνειδος ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐξουδένωμα λαοῦ· δηλωτικά ἐστι τοῦ καὶ πατέρας αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖν τοὺς ἐλπίσαντας ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν καὶ σωθέντας ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ, οἵτινες καὶ πατέρες ἦσαν τῆς παρθένου, δι’ ἧς ἐγεννήθη ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος, καὶ αὐτὸς σωθήσεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ θεοῦ μηνύων, ἀλλ’ οὐ τῇ αὐτοῦ βουλῇ ἢ ἰσχύϊ πράττειν τι καυχώμενος. Καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ γῆς τὸ αὐτὸ ἔπραξε· λέγοντος αὐτῷ τινος· Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, ἀπεκρίνατο· Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; Εἷς ἐστιν ἀγαθός, ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Τὸ δὲ εἰπεῖν Ἐγὼ εἰμι σκώληξ καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, ὄνειδος ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐξουθένημα λαοῦ, ἅπερ φαίνεται καὶ ὄντα καὶ γινόμενα αὐτῷ προέλεγεν.... Καὶ τὰ ἀκόλουθα· Πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντές με ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με, καὶ ἐλάλησαν ἐν χεῖλεσιν, ἐκίνησαν κεφαλὴν. Ἦλπισεν ἐπὶ κύριον, ῥυσάσθω αὐτόν· <σωσάτω αὐτόν>, ὅτι θέλει αὐτόν· τὰ αὐτὰ ὁμοίως ἐγγίνεσθαι αὐτῷ προεῖπεν.

Now, what follows of the psalm are these things in which he says: “Our fathers hoped in you; they hoped and you rescued them. They cried to you, <and they were saved; they hoped in you> and were not put to shame. But I am a worm, and no man; the disgrace of men, and the contempt of the people” (LXX Ps 21:5–7). They point out that he (the pre-existent Christ) acknowledges as fathers those who hoped in God and were saved by him, who were also the fathers of the virgin by whom he was born and became a man, and he makes known that he would be saved by the same God, but does not boast that he does anything by his will or power. *For he also did the same (when he was) on earth.* When someone said to him, “Good teacher,” he answered, “Why do you call me good? One is good; that is, my Father who is in heaven” (Matt 19:16–17). And when he said, “I am a worm, and no man; the disgrace of men, and the contempt of the people,” *he foretold just as it clearly took place, and happened to him....* And that which follows: “All who see me mock me; they speak with lips and wag their head: He hoped in the Lord, let him rescue him; <let him save him>, because he delights in him.” *He likewise predicted that these things would happen to himself [italics mine].*

(*Dial.* 101.1–3; cf. LXX Ps 21:5–8)

context (1 *Apol.* 21.1; 23.1; 32.10; 2 *Apol.* 6.3–5; *Dial.* 48.1–3; 87.2; 105.1) or assume the incarnation when discussing his pre-creational existence (*Dial.* 61.1; 62.4; 129.4).

This passage presents LXX Ps 21:5–8 as a detailed prediction that the pre-existent Christ uttered about himself. What he foretold in his pre-existent state corresponds to what he said and did when he became incarnate (cf. *Dial.* 103.2; 104.1; 105.2–3; 106.3). This aspect of Justin's interpretation of LXX Psalm 21 also parallels his description of the dual revelation provided by the *Logos* in 2 *Apol.* 10.7–8. Here Justin explains that the *Logos* initially “predicted things to come through the prophets” and then taught “these doctrines” when he became incarnate (cf. 1 *Apol.* 36.1–3). The revelation that the pre-existent *Logos* uttered through the prophets therefore stands in direct continuity with the actions and words of the incarnate *Logos*.⁹²

By indicating that Christ, the *Logos*, acted within biblical history, inspired the Jewish scriptures, and fulfilled them when he became incarnate, Justin presents this figure as the primary point of connection between the Jewish scriptures and the Christ-believing community. Within this framework, the scriptures do not function as the sacred texts of the Jewish people as much as they record the utterances and deeds of the *Logos* that also presage his incarnation.⁹³ The key link between the revelation of the Jewish scriptures and the exegesis of the Christ-believing community thus lies in Christ-believers' knowledge of the *Logos*. Moreover, according to Justin, the identity of the pre-existent Christ also forms the basis for his argument that Christ-believers comprise an entirely new race: “Now since Christ was the First-born (πρωτότοκος) of every creature, he founded another race that is regenerated by him” (*Dial.* 138.2). In Justin's view, the Christ-believing community represents an entirely new type of people who nevertheless possess a connection with the Jewish scriptures because of their relationship to the *Logos*. Since they have received revelation from the incarnate *Logos*,⁹⁴ Christ-believers recognize that these ancient texts are, from start to finish, a source of information about

⁹² Note also 1 *Apol.* 38.1–8, which states that the prophets spoke in the name of Christ when they described instances of suffering in the first person.

⁹³ Overbeck, “Ueber das Verhältniss,” 306–7, similarly concludes that the *Logos* in the writings of Justin represents an innovation that provides continuity between the revelation in the Jewish scriptures and the revelation at the incarnation of Christ: “Deren Hülle warf dann der Logos ab, als er seine Offenbarung vollendend persönlich in die Menschengeschichte trat, und von dieser seiner höchsten Offenbarung sind die Denkwürdigkeiten der Apostel eben nur die Berichte, nicht wie die Schriften des A. T.'s eine Logosoffenbarung selbst” (307).

⁹⁴ Christ-believers receive the implantation of the *Logos* and therefore possess complete understanding of the truth (1 *Apol.* 32.8; 2 *Apol.* 13.5–6).

him.⁹⁵ Given this configuration of the continuity between Christ and the Jewish scriptures, it is natural for Justin to present the Jewish scriptures as the focal point of revelation and the knowledge of Christ, the *Logos*, as the proper lens through which to read these sacred texts (*Dial.* 100.1–2).

Beyond simply providing an explanation of the continuity between the Jewish scriptures and Christ-believers, the concept of Christ as the pre-existent *Logos* helps Justin to demonstrate the close relationship between the knowledge of Christ-believers and non-Jewish traditions. Speculation about the *logos* occurs in various forms within different strands of Greco-Roman philosophy and conveys a wide variety of theories about the nature of this entity.⁹⁶ In the *Apologies*, Justin adapts the Middle Platonist idea of the *logos* as an immanent expression of the transcendent God in order to portray Christ, the pre-existent *Logos*, as the source of all noble philosophy and knowledge (*1 Apol.* 5.3–4; 46.2–5; *2 Apol.* 8.1–3; 9.2; 10.4–8; 13.1–6).⁹⁷ For example, in *1 Apol.*

⁹⁵ See, especially, *1 Apol.* 63.1–17. As Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 36–7, has argued, the close connection that Justin draws between the Jewish scriptures and his citations of Matthew and Luke aim to refute the challenge of Marcion that the gospel cannot be reconciled with the Jewish scriptures. This aim may also stand behind his presentation of the *Logos* as the revelation that links even non-Jewish Christ-believers to the Jewish scriptures.

⁹⁶ Stoics held the belief that the *logos spermatikos* was sown within all living things by the divine *Logos*. Subsequently, some first- and second-century Middle Platonists fused this Stoic concept with Platonic thought to arrive at a definition of the *logos* as a rational principle that emanated from God. For further discussion of this progression, see Goodenough, *Justin Martyr*, 1–32; Emily J. Hunt, *Christianity in the Second Century: The Case of Tatian* (Routledge Early Church Monographs; New York: Routledge, 2003), 74–94. A number of scholars have attributed Justin's concept of Christ as the pre-existent *Logos* to the influence of Middle Platonic thought. See, e.g., A. von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Dritte verbesserte und vermehrte auflage* (3 vols.; Freiburg, Leipzig & Tübingen: Mohr, 1894–1897), 1:511; Carl Andresen, “Justin und der mittlere Platonismus,” *ZNW* 44 (1952): 157–95; M. J. Edwards, “On the Platonic Schooling of Justin Martyr,” *JTS* 42 (1991): 17–34. Others argue that Justin developed his *Logos* theory primarily through dependence upon Philo, the Fourth Gospel, the concept of wisdom in the LXX, or all three. See, e.g., R. Holte, “Logos Spermatikos: Christianity and Ancient Philosophy According to St. Justin's Apologies,” *ST* 12 (1958): 109–68; R. M. Price, “‘Hellenization’ and Logos doctrine in Justin Martyr,” *VC* 42 (1988): 19–20; Trakatellis, *Pre-Existence*, 173. For further discussion, see Charles Nahm, “The Debate on the ‘Platonism’ of Justin Martyr,” *Second Century* 9 (1992): 129–51. It is difficult to determine the extent to which Justin was directly influenced by Middle Platonism.

⁹⁷ The terminology that Justin uses in these passages has fueled considerable discussion regarding the extent to which he relied on Middle Platonism for his understanding of the human acquisition of truth. Andresen, “Justin,” 170–80, holds that Justin borrowed the Middle-Platonic concept of λόγος σπέρματικός as an ethical and moral

5.1–4, Justin refers to the “unreasonable passion” (ἄλόγῳ πάθει) of those who persecute Christ-believers but portrays both Christ-believers and Socrates as those who suffer unjustly because they attempt to draw men to “true reason” (λόγῳ ἀληθείᾳ).⁹⁸ Similarly, in *1 Apol.* 46.2–3, he indicates that Christ is “the *Logos* of whom every race of humans partakes” and that those who lived by reason in the past were Christians, even though they lived prior to the incarnation of Christ.⁹⁹ Justin thus presents Christ, the pre-existent *Logos*, as the sole source of reasonable thought and knowledge.

Notwithstanding these descriptions of the close affinities between the knowledge of Christ-believers and Greek philosophy, Justin ultimately demonstrates the superiority of the insight of the Christ-believing community. He argues that ancient philosophers, like Christ-believers, received their inspiration from the pre-existent *Logos* (*2 Apol.* 10.4–8; 13.1–6) and drew upon the writings of Moses and the prophets in an attempt to attain the truth (*1 Apol.* 44.8–11;

form that was implanted in all humans. According to Andresen, Middle Platonists assimilated Cicero’s doctrine of *semina virtutum* with the Stoic concept of world-pneuma to arrive at their ethical understanding of the λόγος σπερματικός. Holte, “Logos Spermatikos,” 136–42, also recognizes that Justin relies on Stoic and Middle-Platonic thought to describe the human possession of truth (e.g., *2 Apol.* 8.1; cf. 6.3), but argues that Justin transforms this concept by presenting the truth and virtue that philosophers acquire as only a seed or incomplete form of the ultimate truth found in Christ, the divine *Logos*. Holte also notes that Justin distinguishes between Christ, the divine *Logos*, and mere human imitation of the truth (*1 Apol.* 13.6) and maintains that the concepts of λόγος σπερματικός (*2 Apol.* 8.3; 13.3) and τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου (*2 Apol.* 8.1; cf. 6.3; 13.5) in Justin’s writings should not be regarded as identical. In his view, λόγος σπερματικός refers to the divine activity of the *Logos* as the disseminator of truth and τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου to human possession of knowledge.

⁹⁸ Cf. *2 Apol.* 7.3; 10.4–8. E. Benz, “Christus und Sokrates in der alten Kirche,” *ZNW* 43 (1950–1951): 195–224, argues that Justin forges this link between Christ-believers and Socrates primarily because he sees in Socrates the model of a Christian martyr; as Christ-believers of Justin’s day were accused and martyred for being atheists, so was Socrates; cf. Skarsaune, “Justin Martyr,” 64.

⁹⁹ As Oskar Skarsaune, “Judaism and Hellenism in Justin Martyr, Elucidated from His Portrait of Socrates,” in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion: Festschriften für Martin Hengel zum 70 Geburtstag* (vol. 3: Frühes Christentum; ed. Hubert Cancik, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Peter Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 604, explains, Justin links the role of Christ as *Logos* and mediator of creation with his concept of human reason: “It is precisely *as created by God and through the agency of His Logos* that men are endowed with ‘human logos’ (*2 Apol.* 10.8).” He suggests that this connection stands behind Justin’s references to the *logos spermatikos* (*2 Apol.* 8.3; 13.3). In his view, the activity of Christ as *Logos spermatikos* (σπερματικοῦ λόγου in *2 Apol.* 8.3; 13.5) corresponds to the “seed of reason (σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου) implanted in all humankind” (*2 Apol.* 8.1; cf. 13.5).

59.1–60.11).¹⁰⁰ Nevertheless, he maintains that only a limited number of ancient philosophers acquired what was in fact a very partial understanding of the truth, because they did not fully comprehend the *Logos* and the Jewish scriptures (1 *Apol.* 44.8–10; 2 *Apol.* 13.3). By contrast, he asserts that Christ-believers possess the most ancient and complete form of truth because of their knowledge of the *Logos* and his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures. For this reason, Justin concludes that “the truths that people in all lands have rightly spoken belong to us Christians” (2 *Apol.* 13.4; cf. 1 *Apol.* 23.1–3).¹⁰¹

Summary

Luke develops a complex network of links between the traditions and scriptures of Israel and the Jesus movement. Within this portrait of continuity, he presents Jesus and his followers as prophetic messengers who communicate God’s revelation to the people of Israel by declaring how

¹⁰⁰ Despite his emphasis upon the similarity between ancient Hellenistic philosophers and Christ-believers, Justin denies affinity between Christ-believers and Greco-Roman religion. As Peter Widdicombe, “Justin Martyr, Allegorical Interpretation, and the Greek Myths,” *SP* 31 (1997): 234–9, explains, Justin also expresses a similar ambivalence in his attitude toward Greek mythology. He uses Greek mythology positively to argue that myths represent an expression of Christian faith, albeit a distorted version of it, and negatively insofar as he argues that Greek myths were inspired by demons to lead people astray. Similarly, Annette Reed, “The Trickery of the Fallen Angels and the Demonic Mimesis of the Divine: Aetiology, Demonology, and Polemics in the Writings of Justin Martyr,” *JECS* (2004): 163, 168, observes that Justin paradoxically holds opposite views of Hellenistic ideals by arguing, on the one hand, for Plato’s dependence upon Moses for his conception of creation (e.g., 1 *Apology* 59) but asserting, on the other, that demons deceive people by mimicking Mosaic prophecy (e.g., 1 *Apology* 54–55). For further discussion regarding the presentation of Greek religion and philosophy as opposites in the writings of Justin, see Skarsaune, “Judaism and Hellenism,” 594–7; Trakatellis, *Pre-Existence*, 10–4.

¹⁰¹ Adolf Harnack, *History of Dogma* (trans. Neil Buchanan; 7 vols.; Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1896–1905), 2:169–87, and M. Engelhardt, *Das Christentum Justins des Märtyrers. Eine Untersuchung über die Anfänge der katholischen Glaubenslehre* (Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1878), 223–41, have argued that Justin presents Christianity as a philosophy in which the prophets and Christ taught the same timeless truths concerning monotheism, virtue, and immortality. According to this view, Justin creates a link between the Christ-believing community and Greek philosophy by positing a close affinity between the basic beliefs and approaches of both. More recently, however, scholars have rightly contested this view by demonstrating that Justin does not promote a close connection between Christ-believers and contemporary philosophers but only between Christ-believers and ancient Hellenistic philosophers. See, e.g., Skarsaune, “Judaism and Hellenism,” 596–7; Reed, “Trickery,” 166. R. M. Price, “Are there ‘Holy Pagans’ in Justin Martyr?” *SP* 31 (1997): 168–70, also argues that Justin refers only to a “special and limited class” of philosophers when referring to those who were enlightened by the *Logos*.

the Jewish scriptures have been fulfilled. Rather than appealing to—or perhaps even conceiving of—the concept of Christ as pre-existent *Logos* to develop this continuity,¹⁰² Luke uses λόγος-terminology to depict the message of Jesus and his followers as a prophetic word to the Jewish people.¹⁰³ In so doing, he presents their proclamation as the proper continuation of the message of the ancient prophets and as the privileged knowledge, or proper perspective, with which to understand the Jewish scriptures correctly. By contrast, Justin presents Christ as the pre-existent *Logos* who provides the essential continuity between the Jewish scriptures and the Christ-believing community. For Justin, the knowledge of the pre-existent *Logos* also serves as a central key to understanding the scriptures correctly. Furthermore, by presenting the *Logos*, who inspired the Jewish scriptures, as the sole source of primordial truth, Justin can present the knowledge and exegesis of Christ-believers as a superior alternative to non-Jewish sources of truth.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² Although Luke emphasizes the role of Jesus as prophet, he also recognizes other aspects of his identity. Richard Bauckham, "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus," in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (JSJSup 63; ed. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 60–4, also points out that Acts 2:33–35 portrays Christ as the exalted king of Israel who pours out the gift of the Spirit (cf. Ps 110:1), and demonstrates the cosmic impact of the earthly activities of Jesus (Luke 10:17–24). Recently, Simon J. Gathercole, *The Preexistent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), has argued that the synoptic gospels contain references to the pre-existence of Christ, especially in the citation and interpretation of LXX Ps 109:3 (Mark 12:35–37; Matt 22:41–45; Luke 20:41–44), the use of the formulaic phrase "I have come in order to," and the phrase "when the day shall dawn upon us from on high." For a discussion of this argument with reference to the gospel of Luke (Luke 1:78; 12:49–51; 19:10; 22:41–44), see especially 161–70, 236–42. L. W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 323, argues that the absence of any mention of the preexistence of Christ in the synoptic gospels does not necessarily indicate that they were ignorant of this concept.

¹⁰³ M. J. Edwards, "Justin's Logos and the Word of God," *JECS* 3 (1995): 277, sees continuity between Luke 8:11 and Justin's conception of Christ as *Logos*, but this conclusion seems to be founded upon a misunderstanding of Luke 8:11. He argues that Luke personified the "word of God" in Luke 8:11 by identifying the word as sower, but this verse identifies the seed, rather than the sower, as the word of God. Moreover, Luke 8:5 clearly distinguishes between the identity of the sower and the seed: "The sower went out to sow the seed." Although the word and Jesus are at times closely linked in Luke-Acts (e.g., Acts 10:36; 13:26–27), nowhere does Luke depict Jesus as the "word."

¹⁰⁴ Notably, although Overbeck, "Ueber das Verhältniss," 321–2, argues that both Acts and Justin present "pagan" culture in a more positive light than does Paul, he concludes that Justin develops more comprehensive links between Christianity and Greco-Roman philosophy than does Luke.

2.5 CONCLUSION

Like some early Jewish exegetes, Luke and Justin assert that Christ-believers possess an authoritative ability to interpret the Jewish scriptures because of their privileged access to divine inspiration and knowledge. The Qumran community expresses this view by presenting their founder as an authoritative exegete who taught the proper interpretation of the Jewish scriptures to his followers. Similarly, Luke and Justin attribute the origin of the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers to the authoritative instruction and revelation of the risen Christ. Moreover, like the Qumran community, Luke and Justin depict the adoption of the correct understanding of the scriptures as a type of precursor to group membership. That is, they link the acquisition of the proper interpretation of the scriptures with entrance to the community. Luke and Justin thus knit their exegetical claims together with the identity of the Christ-believing community in a manner that bears significant resemblance to the exegetical strategies of certain early Jewish groups.

Although the commonalities between Luke and Justin suggest that they held some similar theological views, the approach of Justin differs significantly from that of Luke insofar as he configures a different type of continuity between the Jewish scriptures and the Christ-believing community. Luke portrays the message and exegesis of Christ-believers as a continuation of the message of the ancient Jewish prophets whereas Justin outlines a connection between the Jewish scriptures and Christ-believers that does not depend on their possession of a direct link with Jewish origins. Not only does his depiction of the pre-existent *Logos* enable Justin to assert that the Jewish scriptures had always attested to the beliefs of Christ-believers rather than to those of Jews; it also facilitates his argument that the former possess an ancient form of philosophical truth that pre-dates and rivals non-Jewish traditions. Justin thus asserts the superiority of the knowledge and exegesis of Christ-believers in relation to the wider Greco-Roman world as well as to Jews.

CHAPTER THREE

COMPETING FOR IDENTITY WITHIN A GRECO-ROMAN MILIEU

3.1 INTRODUCTION

As I noted at the end of Chapter Two, Justin uses the concept of Christ as *Logos*, in part, to assert the superiority of the exegesis of the Christ-believing community over non-Jewish sources of knowledge. Although this aspect of Justin's appropriation of the Jewish scriptures differs from that of Luke and early Jewish apocalyptic groups, it closely corresponds to the exegetical aims of early Jewish and Christian apologists.¹ The latter interpreters appeal to the Jewish scriptures in an attempt to compete for group recognition within the Roman Empire. To do so, they present the Jewish scriptures as more ancient than non-Jewish traditions and the exegesis of their groups as a rival form of philosophical inquiry. To be sure, early Christian apologists had to assert that the sacred texts of Jews were the special province of Christ-believers, but they did not use this type of argument for the sole purpose of distinguishing Christ-believers from Jews. Instead, they combined their claim to possess a privileged understanding of the Jewish scriptures with assertions about the antiquity or superiority of the Jewish scriptures over non-Jewish textual traditions.

¹ Scholars of early Judaism and Christianity frequently discuss the difficulties associated with identifying some ancient writings as "apologetic" literature. When I refer to "apologists" and "apologetic" in this chapter I use such terminology to describe authors or works that defend or compete for the recognition of their groups in relation to non-Jewish traditions within the Greco-Roman world. For an insightful discussion surrounding the challenges related to the use of the category of "apology" to describe early Christian writings, see Sarah Parvis, "Justin Martyr and the Apologetic Tradition," in *Justin Martyr and his Worlds* (ed. Sarah Parvis and Paul Foster; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 115–7; cf. Bernard Pouderon, *Les apologistes grecs du II^e siècle* (Paris: du Cerf, 2005), 138. Notably, Eusebius uses the term *apologia* to refer to works that address an emperor in a trial speech in defense of Christians (e.g., *H.E.* 4.3.1–3; 4.18.2; 4.26.1–2; 5.5.5; 5.17.5). For further discussion, see Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price, and Christopher Rowland, "Introduction: Apologetics in the Roman World," in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (ed. Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price in association with Christopher Rowland; New York: OUP, 1999), 1.

The claim to antiquity was important in the ancient world because it served as proof of originality; a group that could not trace its origins to the ancient past would be subject to the allegation of dependence and consequently have no claim to autochthony.² Similarly, this type of argument finds ongoing expression in the Greek notion that philosophy was at its purest form during the earliest period of human history. Greco-Roman philosophical schools asserted that they possessed a superior form of truth and sought to demonstrate continuity between their writings and a primordial, or ancient, *Urphilosophen*.³ Accordingly, both early Jewish and Christian apologists appropriate the Jewish scriptures as part of an attempt to present their knowledge and origins as more ancient than non-Jewish traditions, and their exegesis as a form of philosophical inquiry that rivals the study of other ancient bodies of literature.⁴

² Arthur J. Droge, *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture* (HUT 26; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989), 1–5; cf. R. A. Oden, “Philo of Byblos and Hellenistic Historiography,” *PEQ* 110 (1978): 122; Per Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works, and Their Importance* (JSPSup 2; Sheffield: JSOT, 1988), 93–4.

³ According to J. H. Waszink, “Some Observations on the Appreciation of the ‘Philosophy of the Barbarians’ in Early Christian Literature,” in *Mélanges offerts à Made-moiselle Christine Mohrmann* (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1963), 41–56, this view is found in essentially two forms: either in the argument that the highest point in the history of philosophy goes back to the earliest Greek philosophy or in the assertion that it goes back to the earliest point in human history before the initial period of Greek philosophy; cf. Droge, *Homer or Moses*, 90.

⁴ Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 49–75, has argued that the presentation of the Christian teaching of the Jewish scriptures by Justin and other early apologists represents an attempt to portray it as a superior alternative to the Greek *paideia*. Even as Greco-Roman culture appealed to Homer as a means of educating its members, so Justin sought to replace this tradition by portraying the Jewish scriptures as the preferred source of ancient tradition and the basis for the formation of Christian culture. From a slightly different perspective, Rebecca Lyman, “Justin and Hellenism: Some Postcolonial Perspectives,” in *Justin Martyr and his Worlds*, 162–8, argues that Justin does not deny the differences between Christianity and Greek philosophy but provides a “sophisticated argument for a truth whose antiquity, explanation for evil, and universal practice offer an original blend of complicity and resistance to traditional *paideia*. . . . Justin as an ‘apologist’ did not translate an existing religion—that is, Christianity—into an external culture for explanation or defense, but reflects an attempt within Roman Hellenism by an educated provincial to address contemporary problems of religious authenticity and multiple authorities” (166). Similarly, Tim Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation* (Oxford: OUP, 2001), 88, argues that sophists of the first and second centuries frequently imitated classical texts. This *mimesis* of classical Greek culture involved an ongoing process of negotiating the relationship between the past and the present.

Scholars have long noted that early Christian apologists follow their early Jewish counterparts in appealing to the Jewish scriptures to defend the status of their groups in relation to non-Jewish traditions.⁵ Many also suggest that Luke wrote with the similar aim of gaining recognition for Christ-believers within Greco-Roman society.⁶ Indeed, those who have argued that Luke and Justin hold parallel theological perspectives often point to commonalities between their representations of Greek philosophy and Roman political power. Such studies have suggested that the emphasis upon the correct interpretation of the Jewish scriptures in the writings of Luke and Justin serves a similar apologetic purpose, namely, to demonstrate the ancient origins of the Christ-believing community and therefore its legitimacy in the eyes of the non-Jewish world.⁷ In particular, Gregory E. Sterling has argued that Luke-Acts stands within the genre of “apologetic historiography” and concludes that both Jewish historiographers and Luke appeal to

⁵ E.g., Johannes Geffcken, *Zwei griechische apologeten* (Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1907), ix; B. Z. Wacholder, *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (HUCM 3; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1974), 57–70; H. Koester, “Early Christian Literature,” in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume* (ed. Keith Crim; Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 555; Droge, *Homer or Moses*, 8; Judith M. Lieu, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of Christians in the Second Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 159–60; Richard A. Norris Jr., “Apologists,” in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature* (ed. Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth; Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 36.

⁶ For example, a number of commentators suggest that Luke writes to portray Christ and Christ-believers as innocent of violations against Rome or Roman law (e.g., Luke 23:4, 13–16, 20–22; Acts 23:28; 25:8–12; 26:30–32) and to defend their position in relation to Greco-Roman religious practices and thought (Acts 14:15–18; 17:22–31). The label of “apologetic” to describe these aims in Luke-Acts goes as far back as C. A. Heumann, “Dissertatio de Theophilo cui Lucas Historiam Sacram Inscriptit,” *Bibliotheca Historico-Philologico-Theologica*, Classis IV (Bremen, 1720), 483–505. E. Zeller, *Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihrem Inhalt und Ursprung kritisch untersucht* (Stuttgart: C. Macken, 1854), 365–9, suggested that Luke wanted to demonstrate that Christianity was not a politically dangerous movement; cf. F. Overbeck, *Kurze Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte, Von W. M. L. de Wette, Vierte Auflage bearbeitet und stark erweitert von Franz Overbeck* (Leipzig, 1870), 270–1, 367–8. For a helpful discussion of the numerous ways that the apologetic aims of Luke-Acts have been categorized, see Loveday Alexander, “Acts of the Apostles as an Apologetic Text,” in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire*, 15–38; cf. Richard J. Cassidy, *Society and Politics in Acts of the Apostles* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1988), 158–70; Bertil Gärtner, *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation* (ASNU 21; Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1955), 203–28.

⁷ See, especially, my discussion of Overbeck, O'Neill, Hyldahl, and of the more recent arguments of Pervo and Nasrallah in the introduction to this study.

the Jewish scriptures to describe the remote origins and distinct identity of their respective groups within the Roman Empire.⁸

In this chapter, I will explore the extent to which Luke and Justin lay claim to the Jewish scriptures as part of an effort to articulate the identity of the Christ-believing community in relation to their wider Greco-Roman context. To provide a framework for this comparison, I will briefly note the most common ways that early Jewish and Christian apologists appeal to the Jewish scriptures for this purpose: 1) the presentation of the Jewish scriptures as a source of truth that is older than, or superior to, non-Jewish traditions; 2) the depiction of the study of the scriptures as a form of philosophical inquiry that rivals that of Greek philosophical schools; and 3) the portrayal of the Mosaic law as an exemplary, or superior, form of legislation and ethical guidance. Subsequently, I will consider the extent to which Luke and Justin use these strategies. Although a number of scholars have correctly concluded that Luke uses Hellenistic historiographical methods and expresses apologetic concerns, I will here argue that his appropriation of the Jewish scriptures differs substantially from that of Justin as well as other early Jewish and Christian apologists.

⁸ Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (NovTSup 64; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 17, 297–310, 369–89, defines the genre of “apologetic historiography” as “the story of a subgroup of people in an extended prose narrative written by a member of the group who follows the group’s own traditions but Hellenizes them in an effort to establish the identity of the group within the setting of the larger world” (17). He argues that Jewish, as well as other Oriental, historiographers sought to champion the identity and antiquity of their particular people groups within the Hellenistic world. This position is held by a number of scholars of Luke-Acts, albeit with varying nuances. Some scholars formerly held to a *religio licita* theory, which posits that Rome had a list of permitted, or licensed, religions. See, e.g., Eckhard Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* (SUNT 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 84; Burton Scott Easton, *Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts, and Other Papers* (London, SPCK, 1955), 41–57. Although the *religio licita* theory has been successfully challenged (see, especially, H. J. Cadbury, “Some Foibles of New Testament Scholarship,” *JBR* 26 [1958]: 215–6; Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* [Studies of the New Testament and its World; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982], 91–3), Phillip Francis Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: the Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (SNTSMS 57; Cambridge: CUP, 1987), 214–9, argues that Luke nevertheless attempts to present the Christ-believing community as an “ancestral religion” in order to show the legitimacy of the movement and to demonstrate that it represented no threat to Rome; cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1988), 22; Laura Nasrallah, “The Acts of the Apostles, Greek Cities, and Hadrian’s Panhellenion,” *JBL* 127 (2008): 565–6; Richard I. Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa, CA: 2006), 256, 328–9.

3.2 THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES IN THE WRITINGS OF THE EARLY APOLOGISTS

As part of their bid for cultural recognition, certain early Jewish authors appeal to the Jewish scriptures to present their race and scriptural heritage as older than those of Greeks and other peoples. For example, Eupolemus draws upon biblical history to depict Moses as the originator of philosophy, the alphabet, and written laws (*P.E.* 9.26; *Strom.* 1.23).⁹ These descriptions serve to demonstrate the originality and superiority of Jewish traditions. Similarly, Artapanus expands the biblical accounts of Abraham, Moses, and Joseph in order to demonstrate that these biblical heroes, rather than Egyptians and Greeks, were the founders of culture.¹⁰ Furthermore, the first known Jewish philosopher, Aristobulus, asserts the superiority of Mosaic law by arguing that Plato, Socrates, and Pythagoras imitated this legislation. He maintains that these later philosophers marveled at the wisdom and divine inspiration of Moses and therefore used his writings in their own works.¹¹

In the Roman era, the Jewish historian Josephus depicts himself as an inspired interpreter of the Jewish scriptures (e.g., *B.J.* 3.351–354, 400–402; 4.312).¹² Rather than using this type of description to compete with other Jews, however, Josephus appeals to the Jewish scriptures to demonstrate the superior status of his people and their

⁹ Carl R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: Volume 1: Historians* (Texts and Translations Pseudepigrapha Series 20; Chico: Scholars, 1983), 93–107, regards Eupolemus as an important forerunner of Josephus and argues that his work is the first representation of the tradition that Josephus would later embody; cf. Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 83–4. For discussion of the date and provenance of Eupolemus, see John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 30, 46–7; Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 207; Droge, *Homer or Moses*, 13–4.

¹⁰ Alexander Polyhistor preserved the works of Eupolemus and Artapanus in *On the Jews*, a composition that Eusebius preserved in fragmentary form in chapter nine of his *Praeparatio evangelica*. See also Clement of Alexandria's *Strom.* 1.23; 1.41.1–4; 1.53.4; 1.154.2–3. For discussion of date and provenance of Artapanus, see Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 168–9; Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 32–3; Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 106.

¹¹ Aristobulus lived and wrote in the second century BCE but his writings are extant only in fragmentary form in the writings of Eusebius (*H.E.* 7.32.16–18 and *P.E.* 8.9.38–8.10.17; 13.12.1–16) and Clement of Alexandria (*Stromateis*, books 1, 5, and 6).

¹² Although Josephus characterizes himself as an inspired exegete, this theme is not nearly as prominent as his attempts to demonstrate the superiority of the Jewish scriptures over all other ancient traditions.

traditions. In the *Antiquities*, he portrays significant Jewish ancestors as exemplars or originators of the most ancient and noblest aspects of human civilization:¹³ Abraham as the figure who taught science to the Egyptians (A.J. 1.154–168), Moses as the originator of the best political constitution (A.J. 3.223), and the ancient writings of Jews as predictions about the entire plan of world history (A.J. 10.266–281; 11.1–3, 331–339).¹⁴ In his treatise *Against Apion*, or *On the Antiquity of the Jews*,¹⁵ Josephus likewise contrasts the culture, knowledge, and records of Greeks with the Jewish scriptures (C. Ap. 1.6–14), and argues that the latter represent a more ancient and accurate record of history (C. Ap. 1.29–37).

Josephus further attempts to assert the superiority of the Jewish scriptures over competing Greco-Roman traditions by portraying the Mosaic law as a superior form of legislation. In the *Antiquities*, he maintains that the Mosaic code is better than other forms of legislation because it originates from the contemplation of God and corresponds to the nature of the universe (A.J. 1.18–24). Similarly, in *Against Apion*, he asserts that the law of Moses benefits all humanity (C. Ap. 2.282–284, 293–295). This latter description addresses critics who accused Jews of contributing nothing useful to civilization (C. Ap. 2.135–136, 148, 182). Far from producing no eminent wise men or inventors, Josephus argues, the Jewish nation originated the most

¹³ Louis H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton: PUP, 1993), 210–32; idem, *Judean Antiquities Books 1–4* (vol. 3. Flavius Josephus Translation and Commentary; ed. Steve Mason; Leiden: Brill, 2000), xxvi–xxviii; Harold W. Attridge, *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus* (Missoula: Scholars, 1976), 63–6, idem, “Josephus and His Works,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; ed. Michael E. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 224–5; Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992), 64–6.

¹⁴ Feldman, *Antiquities*, xxiii–xxiv; Steve Mason, “The *Contra Apionem* in Social and Literary Context: An Invitation to Judean Philosophy,” in *Josephus’ Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek* (AGJU 34; ed. Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 200–1.

¹⁵ Josephus does not give this subsequent work the title *Against Apion*. Jerome appears to have used the title *Contra Apionem* (see, e.g., *Ep.* 70.3; *De vir. Ill.* 13; *Adv. Iov.* 2.14) but it is somewhat misleading since Apion, an Egyptian who lived in the first part of the first century CE, could not have been familiar with the *Antiquities*. Notably, Origen (*C. Cels.* 1.16; 4.11) and Eusebius (*H.E.* 3.9.4; *P.E.* 8.7.21; 10.6.15) refer to the work as *On the Antiquity of the Jews* apparently because it was written as a response to critics of the *Antiquities* who argued that Jews were a relatively modern race (C. Ap. 1.216).

ancient and excellent constitutional system (C. Ap. 2.149–156), one that others have attempted to imitate because of its universal value and significance (C. Ap. 2.168, 281–286).

Josephus further aims to demonstrate the superiority of the Mosaic law over competing Greco-Roman traditions by portraying it as an ancient source of philosophy. He indicates that those who study and follow the Law of Moses will find it “profound and highly philosophical” (ἡ θεωρία καὶ λίαν φιλόσοφος; A.J. 1.25; cf. 1.18) and will experience “a happy life” (εὐδαίμονια βίον; A.J. 1.20; cf. 3.84). This description corresponds to the Greek notion that happiness (εὐδαιμονία) was the aim of philosophical inquiry (e.g., Aristotle, *N.E.* 10.6.1; Epictetus *Diss.* 1.4.32).¹⁶ Elsewhere, he presents different groups within Judaism as philosophical schools (A.J. 13.171–173; 15.371; 18.12–20; cf. *J.W.* 2.162–166) and key figures in the history of Israel as philosophers in their own right (e.g., A.J. 1.154–168, 238; 2.7, 291; 4.328; 5.118; 7.158; 8.34, 42, 167; 10.193).¹⁷ Moreover, in *Against Apion*, Josephus presents himself as one who is thoroughly trained in the “philosophy (φιλοσοφία) of the sacred writings of Jews” (C. Ap. 1.54), and asserts that Greek philosophers depended upon Moses for their concept of God (C. Ap. 2.167–168, 257, 281).¹⁸ By depicting the Mosaic law in this way, Josephus not only argues for the antiquity of the Jewish scriptures; he also presents their superiority over Greek philosophical traditions.

The struggle of the Jewish people for recognition within a competing non-Jewish culture also influences the presentation of the Jewish scriptures in the writings of Philo of Alexandria. Like Josephus, Philo portrays the scriptures as a source of philosophical inquiry. He describes Abraham and Moses as all-wise philosophers (*Abr.* 13; *Mos.* 1.18–29, 48), and himself as an inspired interpreter of scripture who functions

¹⁶ Moreover, the ideal constitution was a topic of discussion for philosophers, and philosophy itself was regarded as the practice of a particular way of life. See Feldman, *Antiquities*, xxix–xxx; Mason, “Social and Literary Context,” 187.

¹⁷ On this theme in the *Antiquities*, see Feldman, *Ancient World*, 210–4, 261–3; idem, *Antiquities*, xxix–xxxii; Carl H. Holladay, *Theios Aner in Hellenistic Judaism: A Critique of the Use of This Category in New Testament Christology* (SBLDS 40; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 102. There are also significant points of contact between the writings of Josephus and Stoic thought. For example, he presents Abraham as a Stoic-like philosopher (A.J. 1.156) and Moses as a Stoic sage (A.J. 2.229), and uses Stoic terminology to describe God (e.g., πρόνοια εὐμένεια; A.J. 2.219; 4.180, 185).

¹⁸ 4 Maccabees also associates the study of and loyalty to the Mosaic law with philosophy (see, e.g., 4 Macc 1:1, 17; 7:9).

as a philosopher through this exegetical activity (e.g., *Cher.* 27, 48; *Somn.* 2.252; *Spec.* 3.1–6).¹⁹ Philo also presents the synagogue study of the Jewish scriptures as the engagement of Jews in their “ancestral philosophy” (πατρία φιλοσοφία; *Somn.* 2.127; *Mos.* 2.216; *Legat.* 156, 245; *Spec.* 2.61–62), and the allegorical exegesis of the Therapeutae as a revelatory experience in which they practice “sacred philosophy” (ἱερὰ φιλοσοφία; *Contemp.* 25–26, 28, 67, 69, 89).²⁰ He thus presents the Jewish scriptures as an ancient source of philosophical truth and the exegesis of the Jewish people as a superior form of philosophical inquiry.²¹

Philo also advances arguments to demonstrate the superiority of the Mosaic law. He argues that Greek philosophers depended upon the writings of Moses to develop their thought and legislation (*Prob.* 57; *Aet.* 17–19; *Leg.* 1.108; 4.61; *Her.* 214), and presents the Mosaic code as a divinely-inspired source of wisdom, piety, and virtue (*Mos.* 2.8–11, 45–65; cf. *Leg.* 1.56–59; 4.133–135; *Contemp.* 28).²²

¹⁹ G. E. Sterling, “Platonizing Moses: Philo and Middle Platonism,” *SPhilo* 5 (1993): 99–100; David M. Hay, “Philo’s View of Himself as an Exegete: Inspired, but not Authoritative,” *SPhilo* 3 (1991): 44–50. Some suggest that Philo portrays his allegorical exegesis as a revelatory experience analogous to the revelation Moses received (*Cher.* 27–29; *Somn.* 2.252; *De Migr. Abr.* 47–49; *Mos.* 1.66; 2.250–252, 280–281). See, e.g., David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 147–9; John R. Levison, “Philo’s Personal Experience and the Persistence of Prophecy,” in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (OTS 427; ed. Michael Floyd and Robert D. Haak; New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 194–209. Others correctly point out, however, that Philo infrequently describes his experiences of inspiration and does not appear to claim a unique status as inspired exegete. Moreover, the reverence he expresses toward the Jewish scriptures implies that he ascribes a special status to them that he does not claim for himself. See, e.g., Hay, “Philo’s View,” 47–50; H. A. Wolfson, *Philo* (2 vols.; Cambridge: HUP, 1948), 2:52, 54.

²⁰ Both Philo and Josephus also describe other Jewish groups as philosophical schools (e.g., *Prob.* 67, 80; *J.W.* 2.119).

²¹ Peder Borgen, “Philo of Alexandria,” in *Jewish Writings*, 262; idem, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time* (NovTSup 86; Brill: Leiden, 1997), 9–10; Sterling, “Platonizing Moses,” 102–3; David T. Runia, *Exegesis and Philosophy: Studies on Philo of Alexandria* (Hampshire: Variorum, 1990), 189–90; Wolfson, *Philo*, 1:141–3.

²² For further discussion of Philo’s emphasis upon piety and virtue, as well as the relationship between these values and Greek philosophy, see John M. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists. A Study of Platonism 80 BC to AD 200* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1977), 149–53. For a consideration of the manner in which Philo associates Mosaic laws with Greek virtues, see Naomi G. Cohen, “The Greek Virtues and the Mosaic Laws in Philo: an Elucidation of *De Specialibus Legibus* IV 133–35,” *SPhilo* 5 (1993): 9–19.

Furthermore, in his view, those who follow the law of Moses conduct their lives in a manner that is harmonious with nature, the order of the universe, and right reason (e.g., *Mos.* 2.11, 14, 48–52; *Q.E.* 2.19; cf. *Opif.* 3, 171d–172; *Prob.* 46–47). As such, the Mosaic law serves as a written representation of an unwritten universal law and so functions as “a law for the whole world” (*Q.E.* 2.42).²³ Philo thus presents the Mosaic law as a form of legislation and moral guidance that rivals all other traditions.

The survival of the writings of early Jewish apologists depended, in part, on church fathers who recognized their significance for the development of the early Christian apologetic tradition (e.g., Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Eusebius).²⁴ Although it is difficult to determine the extent to which the earliest Christian apologists drew upon the works of these Jewish authors, those who appeal to the Jewish scriptures do so with a notably similar aim; namely, to demonstrate the superiority of these sacred texts over competing non-Jewish traditions. Accordingly, early Christian apologists lay claim to the Jewish scriptures by asserting that Christ-believers alone understand them correctly, but they combine this assertion with arguments that present the knowledge and practices of Christ-believers as a superior alternative to Greek traditions and philosophy.

²³ Notions of unwritten law and natural justice stretch as far back as the fifth century BCE (e.g., Plato, Sophocles), but Stoics were the first to develop the idea of a universal natural law. Cicero provides an especially clear description of the law of nature and develops this concept more than his predecessors (e.g., *De Rep.* 3.33; *De Leg.* 1.18–19). For further discussion, see John W. Martens, *One God: One Law: Philo of Alexandria on the Mosaic and Greco-Roman Law* (AMMTC 5; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 1–30; cf. Gisela Striker, “Origins of the Concept of Natural Law,” in *Essays on Hellenistic Epistemology and Ethics* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 209–20; Hindy Najman, “The Law of Nature and the Authority of Mosaic Law,” *SPhilo* 11 (1999): 55–73; Richard A. Horsley, “The Law of Nature in Philo and Cicero,” *HTR* 71 (1978): 36–40. Although the concept of a universal law, or law of nature, derives from a combination of Stoic traditions and an eclectic form of Platonic philosophy, Philo transforms this idea by associating it with a written legislation. Such a fusion would have been alien to early Hellenistic philosophers who contrasted written law codes with natural law and believed the latter to be superior to the former (e.g., Cicero, *Off.* 3.69). For further discussion, see Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 76; Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria*, 140–57; Helmet Koester, “NOMOS ΦΥΣΕΩΣ: The Concept of Natural Law in Greek Thought,” in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (SHR 14; ed. Jacob Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1968), 522–7.

²⁴ Borgen, “Philo of Alexandria,” 280; Michael E. Hardwick, *Josephus As an Historical Source in Patristic Literature Through Eusebius* (Brown Judaic Studies 128; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989), 1–2.

A number of second-century Christian apologists show evidence of early stages in the development of this approach. In his *Embassy on Behalf of Christians*, for example, Athenagoras affirms that Greek poets and philosophers rightly believe in one deity, but do not fully understand God because they rely upon their own conjectures; each comes to his own conclusions about God through guesswork and approximation.²⁵ By contrast, he argues, Christ-believers possess a knowledge of God to which the Jewish scriptures attest (*Leg.* 7.3; cf. *Leg.* 9.1–2). According to Athenagoras, the divine origin of the message of the prophets confirms the beliefs of Christ-believers and thus demonstrates the authenticity of their knowledge over that of Greek philosophers.

Tatian, a disciple of Justin, develops a more thorough contrast between the Christian understanding of the Jewish scriptures and Greek thought than does Athenagoras.²⁶ In his *Oration to the Greeks*, Tatian harshly denigrates Greek philosophy and practices (e.g., *Or.* 1–3, 8–11, 16–19, 22–28), and reports that he experienced liberation from the error of Greek doctrines when he received divine revelation while reading the Jewish scriptures (*Or.* 29.1–2).²⁷ Besides contrasting Greek thought with the Christian interpretation of the Jewish scriptures, the account of his conversion has a philosophical dimension: in his search for truth, Tatian was convinced by the compelling antiquity, monotheism, cosmology, and anthropology of the Jewish scriptures (*Or.* 29.1–2).²⁸ Moreover, Tatian subsequently presents himself as “a

²⁵ As Norris, “Apologists,” 42, notes, the date of Athenagoras’s *Embassy* can be determined by the addressees—Marcus Aurelius (died—180 CE) and Lucius Aurelius Commodus (became associated with his father as emperor in 176 CE). This suggests that the work was written between 176–180 CE.

²⁶ Although Tatian was a disciple of Justin Martyr, his orthodoxy remains a matter of debate. Epiphanius (*Panarion* 1.3.46) indicates that Tatian broke away from the church in 150 CE whereas Eusebius (*Chron.* XII) reports that he did so in 172 CE. For further discussion, see Molly Whittaker, *Tatian: Oratio ad Graecos and Fragments* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), ix; Robert M. Grant, “The Heresy of Tatian,” *JTS* 4–6 (1954): 62–8; Gerald F. Hawthorne, “Tatian and His Discourse to the Greeks,” *HTR* 57 (1964): 166; Emily J. Hunt, *Christianity in the Second Century: The Case of Tatian* (London: Routledge, 2003), 20–51.

²⁷ In *Or.* 29.1–2, Tatian indicates that the “barbarian writings” (i.e., the Jewish scriptures) liberated him from error and that, in this process, his “soul was taught by God.” Elsewhere, Tatian reiterates both the importance of the Jewish scriptures as a source of knowledge (*Or.* 20.2) and the role of the “divine spirit” in obtaining knowledge about God (*Or.* 13.3; cf. 15.1).

²⁸ Whittaker, *Oratio*, xv; Michael McGehee, “Why Tatian Never ‘Apologized’ To The Greeks,” *J ECS* (1993): 154.

disciple of philosophy” who has discovered the most ancient source of truth through his reading of the Jewish scriptures (*Or.* 42.1).

Elsewhere, Tatian assumes that the Jewish scriptures rightly belong to Christ-believers because they have adopted these ancient texts as their system of philosophy. He identifies the Jewish scriptures as “our philosophy,” “our history,” “our prophets,” and “our way of life and history according to our laws” (*Or.* 31.1; cf. 32.1; 35.1, 2; 36.2; 42.1). He also describes Christ-believers as “those who follow the word of God” or “those who obey the word of God” (*Or.* 25.3; 26.3; 30.1).²⁹ Tatian thus concludes that the Jewish scriptures are the special province of Christ-believers because they possess a revelatory understanding of them and use these texts as their source of philosophy and practice. This argument, together with the assertion that the Jewish scriptures represent the most ancient source of truth, enables Tatian to present the knowledge and practices of Christ-believers as a superior alternative to Greek traditions and philosophy.

Shortly after the time of Justin, Theophilus, a second-century apologist and bishop from Syrian Antioch, composed a collection of three treatises known as *Ad Autolycum* (169 CE). In this work, he contrasts the Jewish scriptures with Greek traditions by arguing that Greek authors plagiarized the predictions of the Jewish prophets (*Ad Auto.* 2.12, 37), advancing a chronological argument to demonstrate the antiquity of the Jewish scriptures as compared with other sources (*Ad Auto.* 3.16–30), presenting the Mosaic law as the proper corrective to the immoral and idolatrous practices of Greeks (*Ad Auto.* 2.34–35), and asserting that the prophets composed a more accurate record of early history than Greek accounts because the Spirit and the *Logos* inspired them (*Ad Auto.* 2.10, 30, 33; cf. 3:26).

Alongside his presentation of the antiquity and moral superiority of the Jewish scriptures, Theophilus asserts that these texts are the special possession of Christ-believers. He argues that Christ-believers understand the Jewish scriptures correctly because they have been instructed by the same *Logos* and Spirit that inspired the prophets (*Ad Auto.* 2.30, 33; cf. 2.22). Apparently, for Theophilus, this revelatory ability to interpret the scriptures enables Christ-believers to claim the sacred texts of Jews as their own. He refers to Moses as “our prophet” (*Ad Auto.* 3.18), describes the Jewish scriptures as “the books that

²⁹ In these contexts, “the word of God” appears to refer to the Jewish scriptures.

belong to us,” “our scriptures,” or “our sacred writings” (*Ad Auto.* 2.30; 3.1, 26), and depicts the patriarchs as “our forefathers” (*Ad Auto.* 3.20).³⁰ Theophilus also describes the Mosaic covenant as a “divine law” that God gave for the benefit and restoration of the entire human race (*Ad Auto.* 3.9–10; cf. 2.14, 34–5), and argues that those who obey the law and the prophets (i.e., Christ-believers) receive the benefits promised to those who follow the divine commands of God (*Ad Auto.* 1.14; 2.30, 33).³¹ Through their correct understanding of and fidelity to the Jewish scriptures, Theophilus argues, Christ-believers possess a source of knowledge that is “not only more ancient but also more true than all historians and poets” (*Ad Auto.* 2.30; cf. 2.9–10; 3.1, 16–17, 26, 29).³²

Summary

Both early Jewish and Christian apologists use the Jewish scriptures to defend or gain recognition for their groups by presenting these sacred texts as superior to non-Jewish textual traditions. Early Christian apologists clearly stake out a special claim upon the Jewish scriptures by asserting that Christ-believers possess a privileged knowledge of them. Yet, like early Jewish apologists, they situate such arguments within the context of rivalry with non-Jewish traditions. Not surprisingly, then, both early Jewish and Christian apologists deploy similar strategies when they appeal to the Jewish scriptures. In the majority of cases, these authors argue that the Jewish scriptures are more ancient than non-Jewish traditions or represent a superior source of philosophical inquiry. Furthermore, some authors depict the written Mosaic code

³⁰ Despite these claims, Theophilus still acknowledges that Jews hold a special place as heirs of the promises of the Jewish scriptures. For example, in *Ad Auto.* 3.9, he indicates that God gave the divine law “not only to all the world but especially to the Hebrews” and in this context refers to Jews as the “righteous seed of pious and holy men, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.” Similarly, in *Ad Auto.* 3.11, he states that Isaiah spoke generally to all humans but especially to Israel.

³¹ For further discussion of the salvific function of the Mosaic law in the *Ad Autoly-cum*, see Rick Rogers, *Theophilus of Antioch: The Life and Thought of a Second-Century Bishop* (New York: Lexington Books, 2000), 3–29.

³² In the final section of book three, Theophilus also provides a chronological argument that aims to demonstrate the antiquity of the Jewish scriptures as compared with other sources (*Ad Auto.* 3.16–30). He concludes that this chronology shows the antiquity of the prophets and the divine nature of the Christian message (3.29). The chronology appears to rely on material from *Against Apion* (compare *Ad Auto.* 3.20–25 with *C. Ap.* 1.93–154). For an evaluation of the parallels between the two works, see Hardwick, *Josephus*, 12–4.

as a superior form of legislation or ethical guide. Through this type of argumentation, both early Jewish and Christian apologists attempt to show the legitimacy of the origins of their groups within the non-Jewish world.

3.3 JUSTIN: RECOVERY OF PRIMORDIAL TRUTH

Since I have already outlined the way that Justin uses the concept of Christ as pre-existent *Logos* to demonstrate the superiority and antiquity of the exegesis of Christ-believers, a brief review of some key passages in his writings will serve to illustrate the close affinity between some of his appeals to the Jewish scriptures and those of other early Jewish and Christian apologists. For this reason, I will first discuss select passages from his *1 Apology* and the *Dialogue* before turning to a more lengthy consideration of the extent to which the use of scripture in Luke-Acts fits into the same type of apologetic tradition.

Perhaps Justin should be identified as the Christian apologist who first develops an apologetic approach to the Jewish scriptures.³³ As with his description of Christ as the pre-existent *Logos*, Justin presents the Christian exegesis of the Jewish scriptures as a form of knowledge that rivals Hellenistic philosophy. In the *Apologies*, this type of argument plays a central role in Justin's defense of the doctrine and practices of Christ-believers. Initially, he attempts to show the similarity between the teachings of Christ-believers and the writings of Greek philosophers, and asks why the former are punished as criminals when they hold views that are similar to the latter (*1 Apol.* 7.3; 20.1–22.6; 26.6).³⁴ Ultimately, however, Justin draws a contrast between the two.

³³ Note that Athenagoras, Tatian, and Theophilus all composed their works shortly after the time of Justin. For further discussion of Justin as the inventor of the genre of Christian apology in its classical form, see Parvis, "Apologetic Tradition," 115–27.

³⁴ He argues that the incarnation and earthly ministry of Christ resembles myths about Mercury, Perseus, and Aesculapius (*1 Apol.* 22.1–6), and notes points of agreement between Christian doctrine and the teachings of Plato, Stoics, and other Greek philosophers and poets (*1 Apol.* 20.1–5; cf. 8.1–5; *2 Apol.* 13.1–3). See also Justin's description of the connection between the persecution of Socrates and Christ-believers in *1 Apology* 5. R. M. Price, "Are there 'Holy Pagans' in Justin Martyr?" *SP* 31 (1997): 168–9, maintains that Justin links Greek philosophers and Christ-believers because he sees them as fellow victims of persecution; cf. Oskar Skarsaune, "Judaism and Hellenism in Justin Martyr," in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (3 vols.; Frühes Christentum; ed. Hubert Cancik, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Peter Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996),

He presents the Jewish scriptures as the most ancient source of truth (1 *Apol.* 23.1–2; 44.8; 54.5; 59.1) and as a repository of Spirit-inspired predictions about Christ (1 *Apol.* 31–35; 37–40; 45; 47–53), on the one hand, and the writings of Greek philosophers as demon-incited mimicry and distortion of the prophets (1 *Apol.* 54.1–55.8; 56.1–4; 57.1; 58.1–3; 62.1; 64.1; *Dial.* 69.2; 70.1), on the other.³⁵ Justin asserts that Greek philosophers and poets borrowed from Moses and other Jewish prophets but did not fully understand the predictions about Christ in these sacred texts; as a result, they did not arrive at an understanding of the truth (1 *Apol.* 44.8–10; cf. 59–60). By contrast, Justin argues, Christ-believers possess a knowledge of Christ that enables them to decipher the full meaning and import of the Jewish scriptures (e.g., 1 *Apol.* 23.1–2; 31.1–32.14; 33.1–2; 36.1–3; 39.1–4; 43.1–2; 49.5; 53.1–3). In this way, he presents both the Jewish scriptures and the Christian understanding of them as superior to Greek philosophy and writings.

In the opening of the *Dialogue*, Justin again presents the inspired exegesis of Christ-believers as a form of knowledge that rivals Greco-Roman philosophical inquiry. Here he argues that contemporary philosophers failed to arrive at truth because they lost the original essence of philosophy and became divided into different schools (*Dial.* 2.1–2).³⁶ By contrast, he argues, the Jewish prophets provide the only reliable

3:596–7. As Skarsaune observes, however, Justin asserts continuity between ancient philosophers and Christ-believers but does not draw the same connection between Christ-believers and contemporary Greek philosophers.

³⁵ For further discussion of Justin's descriptions of the demon-incited mimicry of the Jewish scriptures, see Peter Widdicombe, "Justin Martyr, Allegorical Interpretation, and the Greek Myths," *SP* 31 (1997): 234–9; Annette Reed, "The Trickery of the Fallen Angels and the Demonic Mimesis of the Divine: Aetiology, Demonology, and Polemics in the Writings of Justin Martyr," *J ECS* (2004): 164–5.

³⁶ Although the pre-Christian Justin argues that his pursuit of Platonic philosophy enabled him to arrive at a knowledge of God, the "old man" provides a series of arguments that refute this claim. In *Dial.* 3.4, the pre-Christian Justin defines philosophy as ἐπιστήμη ἐστὶ τοῦ ὄντος καὶ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς ἐπίγνωσις. This description appears to draw upon the Platonic concept of God (ὁ τευχόμενος τοῦ ὄντος; *Phaedo* 66 a 8) but expands it to include themes that will become part of Justin's description of Christian truth (see ἐπιγινώσκει σοὶ τὸν Χριστὸν in *Dial.* 8.2 and τὸ ἐπιγινώσκειν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ in *Dial.* 110.6). For further discussion of the correspondences between this account and Platonic thought, see J. C. M. Van Winden, *An Early Christian Philosopher: Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho Chapters One to Nine* (Philosophia Patrum 1; Leiden: Brill, 1971), 58–110; Niels Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christendium: Eine Interpretation der Einleitung zum Dialog Justins* (Acta theologica danica 9; Copenhagen: Prostant Apud Munksgaard, 1966), 185–224; Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923), 57–100.

knowledge of God because their writings are more ancient than other sources and because they received their information through divine inspiration (*Dial.* 7.1–2).³⁷ In this passage, Justin depicts the Jewish scriptures as a source of truth that “a philosopher ought to know” (*Dial.* 7.2), identifies the words of the “old man,” i.e., the Christian teaching of the Jewish scriptures, as “the only sure and useful philosophy” (*Dial.* 8.1–2), and declares that his discovery of the true interpretation of the Jewish scriptures led him to become a philosopher (*Dial.* 8.2). Although Justin will go on to contrast the exegesis of Christ-believers with that of Jews, in this opening segment of the *Dialogue*, he depicts the Christian exegesis of the Jewish scriptures as the recovery of the ancient, primordial philosophy that the splintered and degenerate philosophies of his contemporaries had lost.³⁸

Justin’s theory of the present-day fragmentation of philosophy and his assertion that Moses and the prophets were the most ancient source of truth also resemble the views held by some Middle Platonists. For example, Numenius of Apamea, a second-century Pythagorean Platonist, attempted to trace Greek philosophies back to ancient origins, especially oriental sources. Although only fragments of the works of Numenius have survived, it is possible to reconstruct a partial picture

³⁷ Scholars of Justin Martyr often refer to the conversion of Justin in the opening section of the *Dialogue* as an account of his discovery of ‘true philosophy.’ For example, Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christentum*, 112–40, argues that *Dialogue* 1–8 describes the Christian understanding of the Jewish scriptures as the rediscovery of primordial philosophy (“die wiedergefundene Urphilosophie”); cf. Van Winden, *Philosopher*, 112–8. Skarsaune, “Judaism and Hellenism,” 70–1, maintains that the account of the conversion of Justin in *Dialogue* 1–8 aims to describe his “conversion from pseudo-philosophy to True Philosophy” (71).

³⁸ Although scholars concur that Justin presents the Christian understanding of the Jewish scriptures as older than and superior to Greek philosophy, they hold differing views regarding the precise nature of Justin’s conception of the relationship between the Christian teaching of the Jewish scriptures and ancient Greek philosophy. R. Holte, “Logos Spermatikos: Christianity and Ancient Philosophy According to St. Justin’s Apologies,” *ST* 12 [1958]: 164–5, maintains that Justin presents the Jewish scriptures as the “original and authentic philosophy” (165) from which other Greek philosophers borrowed. By contrast, Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christentum*, 112–40, 227–55 suggests that the Jewish scriptures represent one among many forms of primordial philosophical wisdom, albeit the only surviving one. For further discussion, see Van Winden, *Philosopher*, 2–3, 42–4, 112–8; Robert Joly, *Christianisme et philosophie: Études sur Justin et les apologistes grecs du deuxième siècle* (Belgique: L’Université de Bruxelles, 1973), 23–6; Skarsaune, “Judaism and Hellenism,” 56–9; Charles Nahm, “The Debate on the ‘Platonism’ of Justin Martyr,” *Second Century* 9 (1992): 129–51.

of his attitude toward ancient literature.³⁹ Besides citing and interpreting the writings of the Jewish prophets, Numenius uses these ancient texts, as well as other sources, to show the legitimacy of his own ideas (*On the Good*, F 1a [E. des Places] = Eusebius, *P. E.* 9.7.1). Numenius argues that the traditions of Plato and Pythagoras agree with those of the famous nations, including Jews, and draws a comparison between Plato and Moses when he states: “What is Plato but Moses in Attic Greek?”⁴⁰ In so doing, he harmonizes the doctrines of non-Greeks with his own Middle Platonic system of thought.⁴¹ Like Numenius, Justin integrates Greek philosophical thought with his representation of the Jewish scriptures, but he differs from Numenius insofar as he privileges the Jewish scriptures as a superior source of philosophical truth and asserts that Plato borrowed from, but did not fully grasp, their true meaning (e.g., *1 Apol.* 33.1–9; 44.8–11; 60.1–2; cf. *2 Apol.* 13.1–3).

Justin further defends the status of Christ-believers in relation to both Jewish and non-Jewish traditions by presenting the ethical requirements of Mosaic law, which Christ-believers practice, as the embodiment of Greek values. He explains that the ethical elements of the Mosaic law promote piety and the practice of justice (θεοσέβειαν καὶ δικαιοπραξίαν) whereas its ritual requirements function as a concession for Jews to prevent them from committing idolatry (*Dial.* 44.2). By using this terminology, Justin appeals to Greek notions of virtue and piety to describe the part of the Mosaic law that Christ-

³⁹ According to Robert Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 58–9, Numenius divides his own activities into two categories—philosophical pursuit of wisdom and truth and satirical “scandalmongering history” (59). Numenius viewed the latter as a type of diversion or game but took the former very seriously.

⁴⁰ Numenius F 8 in Clement, *Strom.* 1.22.150.4. According to Origen, Numenius also drew upon the writings of the Jewish prophets and read them allegorically (see, e.g., Numenius F1c + 10a [E. des Places]; *Contra Celsus*, 4.51). As Lamberton, *Homer*, 81, notes, to read a text allegorically was to treat it with dignity and importance. For further discussion regarding the links between Numenius and second-century Christian authors, see Mark Edwards, “On the Platonic Schooling of Justin Martyr,” *JTS* 42 (1991): 17–34; Droge, *Homer or Moses*, 62–3, 70–2.

⁴¹ According to Rebecca Lyman, “Hellenism and Heresy,” *JECS* 11 (2003): 214, Numenius provided a universal Pythagorean philosophy that included the works of Plato and Egyptian, Hebrew, and Persian writings. He also argued that the multiplicity in contemporary philosophy was due to a decline from the original unity of philosophy. For further discussion regarding the links between Numenius and second-century Christian authors, see Edwards, “Platonic Schooling,” 17–34; Droge, *Homer or Moses*, 62–5, 68–72.

believers observe. He also explains that the new covenant and law (i.e., Christ) indicates which Mosaic precepts are “eternal” and “fit for every race” and which are suited for the hardness of the hearts of Jews (*Dial.* 67.10). This description presents the ethical parts of the written Mosaic law as a type of universal, or natural, law. Moreover, in *Dial.* 45.3–4, Justin explains that people who obeyed the Mosaic law before Christ would be saved because they observed the parts of this code that are good, pious, and just (καλὰ καὶ εὐσεβῆ καὶ δίκαια) and so performed acts “that are universally, naturally, and eternally pleasing to God.” Justin’s division between the ritual and ethical requirements of the Mosaic law helps him to differentiate between the piety of Christ-believers and that of Jews, but it also enables him to demonstrate that those who embrace Christ and his interpretation of the Mosaic code become paragons of Greek justice and piety (*Dial.* 93.1).⁴² In this way, he deploys Greek concepts and terminology to depict the fidelity of Christ-believers to the Mosaic code as an exemplary embodiment of Greek ideals.⁴³ By further identifying parts of the Mosaic legislation as a written representation of unwritten universal law, Justin indirectly argues for its universal relevance and superiority over other written law codes.⁴⁴

⁴² Justin frequently uses such terms to appeal to Greco-Roman sensibilities. For example, in the *Apologies*, he addresses the emperor and his sons as philosophers and pleads with them to judge the case of Christ-believers in a manner that is in keeping with their exemplary piety and philosophy (εὐσεβεῖς καὶ φιλοσόφους; *1 Apol.* 2.1; cf. 1.1; 2.2; 3.2–3; 12.5; *2 Apol.* 2.16; 15.5). These descriptions correspond to the Greco-Roman ideal of a virtuous philosopher-king who governs with wisdom, justice, and piety, and thus brings happiness (εὐδαιμονέω) to his subjects (*1 Apol.* 3.3). In this context, he also attempts to address charges of impiety and injustice (ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν) against Christ-believers (*1 Apol.* 4.7–8; cf. 23.3; *2 Apol.* 3.2). He explains that Christ-believers teach that God approves of those who imitate his inherent virtues, namely temperance, justice, love of man (σωφροσύνην καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ φιланθρωπίαν), and any other virtues that are proper to God (*1 Apol.* 10.1). For further discussion of the use of these terms and values in Greco-Roman, Jewish, and Christian literature, see J. M. Lieu, “The Race of God-fearers,” *JTS* 46 (1995): 483–501; cf. Attridge, *Biblical History*, 63–6; Martens, *One God, One Law*, 56–65; Sarah Broadie, “Rational Theology,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy* (ed. A. A. Long; Cambridge: CUP, 1999), 205–24.

⁴³ Despite this affirmation of the ethical parts of the law, in *Dial.* 95.1–2, Justin explains that Christ had to die because no one can keep the law completely and all are under a curse (cf. Gal 3:10–13).

⁴⁴ Since Hellenistic philosophers typically contrasted written legislation with universal law and believed that the latter transcended the former, the presentation of Mosaic law as universal law serves as a description of its superiority over other types of legislation. For further discussion, see footnote 23 above.

Although Justin frequently contrasts the exegesis of Christ-believers with the scriptural interpretation of Jews who do not believe in Jesus, this brief discussion outlines some of the primary ways that he also appeals to the Jewish scriptures to seek recognition for the Christ-believing group within their wider Greco-Roman context. Like other early Jewish and Christian apologists, Justin uses the Jewish scriptures to demonstrate the antiquity of the origins of his community as well as the superiority of its knowledge and practices over competing non-Jewish traditions.

3.4 LUKE: COMPETITION WITH JEWS

A number of scholars have argued that the emphasis upon the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures in Luke-Acts serves to demonstrate the antiquity, and therefore legitimacy, of the Christ-believing movement in the eyes of Rome.⁴⁵ For example, Sterling has stressed that the Lukan Paul appeals to the Jewish scriptures and to his Jewish ancestors in a series of defence speeches to demonstrate that Christ-believers stood “within an ancient tradition” and therefore were politically innocent.⁴⁶ Sterling maintains that both the emphasis upon the fulfillment of scriptures in Luke-Acts and the claim that Christ-believers belong to an “ancestral tradition” function as a means of portraying this group as a distinct entity that held its own place and ancient heritage within the wider Greco-Roman world.⁴⁷

There is no question that Luke draws upon the Jewish scriptures to demonstrate the unique relationship between these sacred texts and the Christ-believing community; but, rather than using the Jewish scriptures to defend the status of Christ-believers in relation to their Greco-Roman competitors, he consistently evokes the scriptures in settings that outline inner-Jewish concerns and debate. When Luke attempts to demonstrate that the events of his narrative fulfill scriptural prophecy, he repeatedly shows how God fulfills his promises to

⁴⁵ Notably, this claim forms part of the argument that Acts was composed in a second-century context. See, e.g., Nasrallah, “Acts,” 565–6; Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 256, 328–9.

⁴⁶ Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 385–6.

⁴⁷ Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 378–89; cf. Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 256, 328–9; Nasrallah, “Acts,” 565–6.

the Jewish people.⁴⁸ Certainly he reports numerous conflicts over how the scriptures ought to be interpreted and obeyed,⁴⁹ but these reflect a struggle between Christ-believing and non-Christ-believing Jews. Moreover, in scenarios where Luke appeals to the traditions of Jewish ancestors, he has key Jewish figures address the concerns of other Jews rather than those of non-Jewish competitors.⁵⁰

Although this evidence suggests that Luke appeals to the Jewish scriptures and heritage to define Christ-believers in relation to Jews who do not believe in Jesus rather than to articulate their identity with reference to the non-Jewish world, Sterling and others have argued that the use of the Jewish scriptures and traditions in Luke-Acts nevertheless implies that the Christ-believing community deserves recognition within the Roman Empire.⁵¹ For example, in his study of Acts 6–7, Todd Penner builds upon Sterling's thesis that Luke wrote in the tradition of apologetic historiography and drew upon the Jewish scriptures "to construct a particular identity within the community and to promote it without."⁵² He argues that the speech of Stephen in Acts 7:1–53 exemplifies the approach to the scriptures that we find in Josephus and Philo because it resembles their retelling of the Exodus event and uses Greek rhetorical strategies to valorize Moses and his founding of a Jewish *politeia*.⁵³ As Penner himself explains, however, the use

⁴⁸ Luke 1:1–4, 17, 31–33, 46–55, 68–79; 2:30–32; 3:4–6; 4:16–30; 24:25–27, 44–47; Acts 1:15–20; 2:17–36; 3:11–26; 4:25–31; 7:2–53; 8:26–40; 10:34–43; 13:13–52; 15:18–21.

⁴⁹ Luke 6:1–11; 11:25–37; 20:9–19, 27–39, 41–44; Acts 6–7; Acts 13:13–42, 46–47; 18:5–6; 24:5–21; 26:4–11, 24–29; 28:23–28.

⁵⁰ Acts 3:13; 5:30; 15:10; 22:14; 24:14; 26:6; 28:17. In all but two of these references, a Jewish Christ-believer expresses solidarity with all Jews by referring to their ancestors as "our fathers" and to their ancestral traditions as those of "our fathers." See also the phrase "our ancestral law" in Acts 22:3.

⁵¹ See Phillip E. Satterthwaite's, "Acts Against the Background of Classical Rhetoric," in Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, eds., *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting* (vol. 1 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*; ed. Bruce W. Winter; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 360–1, 376–7, for a discussion of Luke's use of "implicit commentary" and "covert persuasion"; cf. Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986–1990), 1:8–9.

⁵² Todd C. Penner, *In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan Apologetic Historiography* (Emory Studies in Early Christianity; New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 260–1, 303–30, at 261.

⁵³ Penner, *Christian Origins*, 300–30, also argues that Luke uses the literary and cultural theme of *philanthropia* to depict the ideal relationships of the Christ-believing community, but Luke never uses this terminology in Acts 6–7 or elsewhere to describe Christ-believers. The only instance of *φιλανθρωπία* occurs in Acts 28:2 where it refers to the kindness of the people of Malta. Furthermore, Luke only uses *πολιτεία* once to

of the Jewish scriptures in the Stephen speech creates polarity between Christ-believing Jews and other Jews, and aims to demonstrate the superiority of the Christ-believing community over Jews who oppose them.⁵⁴ Whereas Philo and Josephus portray Moses as philosopher and legislator of a superior constitution (e.g., Josephus, *A.J.* 1.18–25; Philo, *Mos.* 2.49–51), the speech of Stephen nowhere indicates that the knowledge or legislation of Moses was superior to that of other peoples. Instead, it highlights the authority of Moses as a paradigmatic Jewish prophet who transmits “living oracles” to the Jewish people (Acts 7:37–38). Therefore, although Penner correctly points out that the Stephen speech uses Hellenistic terms and categories to glorify Moses,⁵⁵ the appeal to the Jewish scriptures therein seeks to differentiate Jewish Christ-believers from other Jews, and to claim the ancestry of Moses and other Jewish prophets for the former group.

Early Jewish and Christian apologists who appeal to the Jewish scriptures to demonstrate the antiquity, or superiority, of their groups invariably juxtapose this assertion with a denigrating description of the traditions of their non-Jewish competitors. By contrast, Luke never appeals to the Jewish scriptures to assert the antiquity or cultural priority of the Christ-believing movement over against competing non-Jewish religions or schools of thought. Even in the trial scenes of Paul (Acts 22:30–23:10; 24:1–23; 24:24–25; 25:6–12; 26:1–32), settings that most closely resemble the context of early Christian apologists,⁵⁶

refer to Paul’s Roman citizenship (Acts 22:28). He does not use this terminology to describe the Christ-believing community or the Jewish people.

⁵⁴ Penner, *Christian Origins*, 303–23. See also my discussion of Stephen’s speech in Chapter Five.

⁵⁵ See, especially, Acts 7:22, where we read that Moses received exceptional instruction from the Egyptians (ἐπαιδεύθη Μωϋσῆς [ἐν] πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Αἰγυπτίων) and displayed unusual power (ἦν δὲ δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις αὐτοῦ). This description of Moses does not occur in the Jewish scriptures but is comparable to glorifications of Moses in early Jewish writings (e.g., Philo, *De Vit. Mos.* 1.21–24; Josephus, *A.J.* 2.205, 210, 216, 224, 229–231, 236). See also C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–1998), 1:355–6; Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 269; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 291; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992), 125; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 376.

⁵⁶ Notably, eight of the ten instances of ἀπολογέομαι in the NT occur in Luke-Acts (Luke 19:11; 21:14; Acts 19:33; 24:10; 25:8; 26:1, 2, 24) and five of these occur in the defense speeches of Paul (Acts 24:10; 25:8; 26:1, 2, 24; cf. 19:33). See also the use of ἀπολογία in Acts 22:1 and 25:16. For further discussion of the use of legal language

the appeals to the Jewish scriptures focus solely upon inner-Jewish theological concerns.⁵⁷ The Lukan Paul answers the charges of Jews who question his fidelity to Jewish customs (Acts 24:10–22; cf. 25:8; 26:2–23) by arguing that he worships the God of his Jewish ancestors, hopes in the promises that God made to them, and believes and preaches everything that the prophets and Moses wrote (Acts 24:14; 26:6, 22). This use of the scriptures and ancestral traditions of Jews may help to demonstrate that the activities of Paul did not violate Roman law; but it also shows that the conflict related only to internal Jewish issues.⁵⁸ In contrast to the apologists' appeal to the Jewish scriptures to assert the antiquity and superior status of the Christ-believing community over against competing non-Jewish groups within the Roman Empire, the Lukan Paul uses Jewish scriptures and ancestral traditions to defend himself, and by implication Christ-believers, against the accusations of other Jews who doubt his fidelity to the texts that both groups hold as sacred.⁵⁹

in these scenes, see Allison A. Trites, "The Importance of Legal Scenes and Language in the Book of Acts," *NovT* 16 (1974): 278–84.

⁵⁷ Unlike Sterling's description of Luke-Acts as apologetic historiography, Alexander, "Apologetic Text," 23–44, argues that Acts "lacks the formal structure of an *apologia*" (27) and maintains instead that Luke creates a series of "dramatic situations that call for apologetic speech" (28). She suggests that these types of scenes function as "apologetic scenarios" that are "embedded in the text as dramatic scenes" (28). Alexander notes that Luke stresses the political innocence of Christ-believers, which is why some scholars conclude that he wrote with political apologetic aims, but observes that Luke does not develop a refutation of political charges against them. Instead, the primary concerns in the majority of scenes in Acts that include apologetic speech relate to theological and Jewish issues (Acts 4:1–22; 5:17–42; 6:8–7:60; 17:1–8; 18:12–17; 22:1–21; 23:1–10; 24:1–21; 26:1–32). This leads Alexander to conclude that "Acts is a dramatized narrative of an intra-communal debate, a plea for a fair hearing at the bar of the wider Jewish community in the Diaspora, perhaps especially in Rome" (43). Similarly, Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke* (trans. Geoffrey Buswell; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), 144–8, 167–9, argues that Luke never uses the dispute over the scriptures between Christ-believers and other Jews to address wider Greco-Roman concerns.

⁵⁸ Roman officials also repeatedly conclude that Paul is innocent of violating Roman law and that the dispute between Paul and his opponents relates only to the religious matters of Jews (e.g., Acts 18:13–15; 25:18–22, 26–27; 26:30–32), and Claudias Lysias and Felix only hold him as a prisoner to defer to the Sanhedrin (Acts 22:30; 23:10, 30; 24:27). For further discussion of this theme in Luke-Acts, see Maddox, *Purpose*, 93–7.

⁵⁹ This conclusion stands at odds with that of Abraham J. Malherbe, "'Not in a Corner': Early Christian Apologetic in Acts 26:26," *SC* 5:4 (1985/1986), 193–210; cf. Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 328. Malherbe argues that Luke presents the appeal to the Jewish scriptures in Acts 26:22–29 as analogous to "the Christian apologists' insistence that the prophets were philosophical" (210). Malherbe asserts that the phrase "these

To be sure, on rare occasions, Luke does juxtapose the beliefs of Christ-believers with non-Jewish traditions (Acts 14:8–19; 17:16–34). The most notable example of this occurs in the address of Paul at the Areopagus (Acts 17:16–34).⁶⁰ Like many early Jewish and Christian apologists, in this context, Luke uses philosophical themes to demon-

things have not been done in a dark corner” in Acts 26:26 alludes to the popular view that an ideal philosopher does not confine his discourse to private conversation but boldly participates in public life (e.g., Plato, *Gorgias* 485D; Cicero, *De orat.* 1.13; *de rep.* 1.2.2; Seneca, *Consol. Ad Polyb* 13.3; *Ep.* 68.2; Plutarch, *De curios*, 516B; Lucian, *Deor. Conc.* 1.1; Epictetus, *Diss.* 1.29.36, 55–57; 2.12.17; 2.13.24–26). Accordingly, Malherbe concludes that when the Lukan Paul indicates to Agrippa that “these things have not been done in a dark corner” (Acts 26:26), he is referring to himself as an ideal philosopher who speaks publicly and boldly. Malherbe also argues that the terminology in Festus’s exclamation “Paul, you are mad!” (Μαίνῃ, Παῦλε·) in Acts 26:24 and Paul’s denial of madness and words of self-defense—“I am speaking the sober truth (ἀληθείας καὶ σωφροσύνης ῥήματα ἀποφθέγγομαι)...and...I speak freely (παρρησιαζόμενος λαλῶ)” (Acts 26:25–26)—further confirms that Luke here presents Paul as a philosopher. He draws this conclusion because some Greek authors who were contemporaries of Luke used terms such as μαίνομαι to depreciate inappropriate philosophy and used σωφροσύνη or παρρησία to affirm exemplary philosophy (e.g., Dio Chrysostom, *Discourse* 34; *Or.* 45.1; 66.25; Plutarch, *Quodomo adulator* 71E; Lucian, *Demonax* 3). Two aspects of this argument present difficulties. First, since the phrase “these things have not been done in a dark corner” in Acts 26:26 refers to events in the life of Jesus and the activities of the Christ-believing community, rather than to the preaching of Paul, it is difficult to interpret the phrase as a description of Paul as a philosopher. Instead, the phrase more simply seems to indicate that the activities of the Jesus movement were well-known. Second, the terms μαίνομαι, παρρησία, and σωφροσύνη do not always depict the activities of philosophers but have a wider range of meaning, as shown in Luke-Acts and other NT writings. For example, in Acts 12:15, Luke reports that people regarded Rhoda as mad (μαίνῃ), or crazy, when she reported that Peter was at the door. Luke also uses παρρησία in a number of scenarios to demonstrate the boldness of the preaching of the apostles (e.g., Acts 2:29; 4:13, 29, 31; 28:31) without once implying that they also function as philosophers in these contexts. Similarly, the term σωφροσύνη is used in other NT writings in a non-philosophical way (1 Tim 2:9, 15). Since there are no clear contextual clues in Acts 26:22–29 to suggest that Luke uses μαίνομαι, παρρησία, and σωφροσύνη to depict Paul as a philosopher, it is difficult to conclude with certainty that he intends this meaning for the terms.

⁶⁰ As Witherington, *Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 515, notes, Ἄρειον Πάγον (Acts 17:19) can refer to a location, a council, or both. Barrett, *Acts*, 2:832, maintains that the Areopagus governed Roman Athens and functioned as its chief court. He suggests, however, that Ἄρειον Πάγον in Acts 17:19 may refer to a location—Aeropagus hill. Although Johnson, *Acts*, 314, cites authors that describe trials before the Areopagus (e.g., Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers*, 7.168–169), he concludes that the tone of Acts 17:16–34 does not warrant the conclusion that this passage reports a legal hearing; cf. I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 284–5. B. W. Winter, “On Introducing Gods to Athens: An Alternative Reading of Acts 17:18–20,” *TynBul* (1996): 71–90, argues that Paul does not undergo a formal trial at the Areopagus but appears before the council for an initial hearing.

strate the relevance of the message of Paul to his Greco-Roman audience. Besides situating the speech in Athens, a city that represented the apex of Greek culture, Luke presents Paul as a new Socrates.⁶¹ For example, in Acts 17:17–18, when certain philosophers encounter Paul in the agora they exclaim: “He seems to be a preacher of foreign divinities” (Ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι) and, after leading him to the Areopagus, they describe him as a teacher of “certain strange things” (ξενίζοντα...τινα; Acts 17:20). These accusations recall the charges that Athenians leveled against Socrates and are significant because the story of the trial and defense of Socrates became a Hellenistic model for philosophical integrity (see, e.g., Lucian of Samosata, *Demonax* 11).⁶² Luke thus portrays Paul as a philosophical figure who debates with Epicureans and Stoics (Acts 17:19) and uses their ideas to introduce his message of the resurrection of Jesus (Acts 17:22–31).⁶³

Despite this philosophical context, Luke does not use the Areopagus episode to present the Jewish scriptures as the ultimate source of philosophical truth. Although the speech appears to draw upon biblical concepts, it relies more explicitly upon Greek thought.⁶⁴ As

⁶¹ Stanley Kent Stowers, “Social Status, Public Speaking and Private Teaching: The Circumstances of Paul’s Preaching Activity,” *NovT* 26 (1984): 60–1.

⁶² Barrett, *Acts*, 2:828–30, also notes that the noun ἀγορά in Acts 17:17 recalls Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 1.1.10 and that the phrase πρὸς τοὺς παρατυγχάνοντας recalls Plato, *Apology*, 29d. He further observes the similarity between the phrase Ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι in Acts 17:18 and the use of δαιμόνιον in Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 1.1.2 and the phrase ἕτερα δὲ δαιμόνια καινά in Plato, *Apology*, 24B–C. See also Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:214; Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 518; Witherington, *Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 514–5; Bock, *Acts*, 562; Johnson, *Acts*, 313–4.

⁶³ For Nasrallah, “Acts,” 559–64, the speech of Paul in Acts 17 provides “a philosophical critique of Greek religion” (562) while also offering “a religious option that draws on the rhetoric, traditions, and literature of ancient Greece” (564). She argues that Luke in this way “hybridizes Christianity to the Greekness that was so prestigious and marketable in the Roman Empire” (566).

⁶⁴ Studies of Acts 17:16–34 often emphasize either the Greek philosophical elements of the speech or the Jewish and scriptural ideas that are present in it. For example, Martin Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (London, SCM, 1951), 26–83, provides a detailed description of how the speech does not rely on biblical ideas but on Greek philosophical sources; cf. Phillip Vielhauer, “On the ‘Paulism’ of Acts,” *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert* (ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn; Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 36–7. Others attempt to demonstrate that the speech relies upon ideas from the Jewish scriptures and other Jewish sources. See, e.g., Gärtner, *Areopagus*, 66–169; Bock, *Acts*, 559; John B. Polhill, *Acts* (NAC 26; Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 373. Still others suggest that Luke draws upon both biblical and Hellenistic sources. See, e.g., W. Nauck, “Die Tradition und Komposition der Areopagrede,” *ZTK* 53 (1956): 11–2; Stephen G. Wilson, *The Gentiles and the*

a number of scholars have noted, the descriptions of God as Creator of the universe who cannot be contained in a temple (Acts 17:24–25) recall biblical themes as well as Greek concepts of God.⁶⁵ Similarly, the descriptions of the origins of humankind, the boundaries of their existence, and their attempts to find God (Acts 17:26–27) have points of contact with both Jewish and Greek sources.⁶⁶ Rather than citing and expounding the Jewish scriptures, however, Luke has Paul quote Stoic poets to illustrate the immanence of God: “For ‘in him we live and move and have our being’; as even some of your own poets have said, ‘For we too are his offspring’” (Acts 17:28).⁶⁷ In this philosophical

Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts (SNTSMS 23; Cambridge: CUP, 1973), 198; Barrett, *Acts*, 2:825, 849, concludes that the speech contains themes that Hellenistic Christ-believers “inherited from Hellenistic Jews” (825), but rightly notes that the Greek sources of the speech are more prominent: “The Greek side is unmistakable” (849).

⁶⁵ The idea of God as sole Creator of the universe in Acts 17:24 occurs in the Jewish scriptures (e.g., Isa 42:5; Gen 1:1–2; Ex 20:11) and in Greek literature (e.g., Epictetus 4.7.6; *Corpus Hermeticum* 4.1). Similarly, the idea in Acts 17:25 that God cannot be contained in a temple occurs in Greek sources (Euripides frg. 968) and in the Jewish scriptures (1 Kgs 8:27; Isa 66:1–2). For further discussion of the use of these and other sources in Acts 17:24–25, see Dibelius, *Studies*, 45–6; Gärtner, *Areopagus*, 171–2, 211; Wilson, *Gentile Mission*, 198–200; Johnson, *Acts*, 315; Barrett, *Acts*, 2:839–841; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 608.

⁶⁶ Some interpret the phrase ἐξ ἐνὸς in the phrase ἐξ ἐνὸς πάντων ἔθνων ἀνθρώπων in Acts 17:26 as a reference to Adam. If πάντων ἔθνων ἀνθρώπων refers to the entire human race, as Dibelius, *Studies*, 29–32, argues, it would articulate a Hellenistic view of humanity whereas if we render πάντων ἔθνων ἀνθρώπων as “every nation of men” (RSV), Acts 17:26 would more clearly provide a biblical view that all the nations of the earth originated from one man, Adam. The meaning of the terms καιρούς and ὁροθεσίας in the phrase ὀρίσας προστεταγμένους καιρούς καὶ τὰς ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν in Acts 17:26 is also debated. Gärtner, *Areopagus*, 154, maintains that καιρούς means “epochs of history” and ὁροθεσίας means “national boundaries,” and concludes that the phrase expresses the biblical view of the history of the nations, which is divided into pre-determined epochs (e.g., Dan 8:19; Deut 32:8). Dibelius, *Studies*, 28–9, argues that καιρούς should be interpreted as “seasons of the year” and ὁροθεσίας as “zones.” If so, Acts 17:26 would describe the philosophical idea that the universe has five zones, two of which humans inhabit (Vergil, *Georg.* 1.237–238; Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 1.28.68–69). Similarly, the language of seeking, groping for, and finding God in Acts 17:27 (ζητεῖν τὸν θεόν, εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτὸν καὶ εὑροῖεν) can be taken as a rational search for God through philosophy (Plato, *Apology* 19b; 23b; *Gorgias* 457d; *Rep.* 449a) or as a reference to seeking God in biblical texts (e.g., Isa 55:6; 65:1; Ps 14:2; Pr 8:17; Jer 29:13). For further discussion, see Dibelius, *Studies*, 28–34; Gärtner, *Areopagus*, 152–61; Barrett, *Acts*, 2:842–4; Bock, *Acts*, 566–8.

⁶⁷ The source of the phrase Ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν is difficult to identify. A Syriac writer called Isho’dad (ninth century) cited a passage in which Minos of Crete describes Zeus in this way, but Clement of Alexandria ascribes it to Epimenides of Crete (*Strom.* 1.14.59). The phrase Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν appears to derive from the poet Aratus who wrote in praise of Zeus (*Phaenomena* 5), and Clement of Alexandria links the phrase to this source (*Strom.* 1.19.91). Diogenes

context, then, it is Stoic traditions, rather than the Jewish scriptures, that serve as the primary supporting texts for Paul's message. The Areopagus sermon of Paul does not present the Jewish scriptures as a form of ancient philosophical truth that rivals Greco-Roman philosophies, but uses non-Jewish traditions to introduce a call to repentance (Acts 17:29–31).⁶⁸

Furthermore, although Luke draws upon Stoic traditions to describe an understanding of God that all humans receive, he does not identify the Mosaic code—in Acts 17 or elsewhere—as a universal form of ethical knowledge. Unlike Justin, Luke does not distinguish between ethical and ritual aspects of the Mosaic law nor does he appeal to Greek concepts of piety, virtue, or natural law to describe the Mosaic code.⁶⁹ Instead, he highlights the piety of Jesus and Jewish Christ-believers by outlining how they observe the entire Mosaic law (e.g., Luke 1:6; 2:21–24, 27, 39; 5:14–15; 17:14; 23:56; Acts 21:20, 24; 22:12; 24:14).⁷⁰

Laertius also ascribes a similar phrase to Epimenides (*Lives of Philosophers* 1.112) and a similar line occurs in Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*. For further discussion of these sources, see Marshall, *Acts*, 288–9; Barrett, *Acts*, 2:846–8; Johannes Munck, *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; Garden City: Doubleday, 1967), 171; Wilson, *Gentile Mission*, 296–309; Johnson, *Acts*, 316; Bock, *Acts*, 568–9.

⁶⁸ Luke elsewhere provides little evidence of associating the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers with philosophy. The description of Paul's movement from the synagogue to the lecture hall of Tyrannus in Acts 19:8–10 may imply that he expounded the scriptures in a philosophical setting. The brevity of the description of Paul's activities in Acts 19:8–10, however, does not readily suggest that Luke wanted to emphasize this event or to present the scriptural interpretation of Paul as a type of philosophical inquiry. Furthermore, although Gregory E. Sterling, "'Athletes of Virtue': An Analysis of the Summaries in Acts (2:41–47; 4:32–35; 5:12–16)," *JBL* 113/4 (1994): 679–96, argues that the summary descriptions in Acts 2:41–47, 4:32–35, and 5:12–16 follow a Hellenistic literary tradition in which authors attempt to describe a group as a type of religious-philosophical community, Luke does not once refer to the Christ-believing community as a "philosophical" group nor does he present their exegesis as a type of philosophy. Compare, for example, Philo, who indicates that the Essenes practice philosophy (φιλοσοφίας; *Prob.* 80) and presents the study of the scriptures by the Therapeutae as "the sacred philosophy" (τῆς ἱερᾶς φιλοσοφίας) and as "the ancestral philosophy" (τὴν πάτριον φιλοσοφίαν; *Contemp.* 25–26, 28). Similarly, Josephus describes the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes as three forms of "Jewish philosophy" (Ἰουδαίους εἶδη φιλοσοφεῖται; *J.W.* 2.119).

⁶⁹ In Luke 10:25–28, the Lukan Jesus affirms the lawyer's conclusion that certain moral requirements of the Mosaic law (i.e., loving God and neighbor) are essential for attaining eternal life but, unlike Mark, he does not indicate that these elements of the Mosaic law are more important than its ritual requirements (cf. Mark 12:31–33).

⁷⁰ Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 238–48, suggests that Luke tends "to moralize" ritual purity and to express the religious values of Christ-believers in "the language of contemporary ethics" (238). Luke's treatment of the Mosaic law is unsystematic, however, and does not lend itself to drawing firm conclusions about his views on this topic.

Certainly Luke depicts conflicts between Jesus and his followers, on the one hand, and other Jews, on the other, over what proper observance of the Mosaic law entails (e.g., Luke 6:1–11; 13:10–17; 14:1–6; Acts 6:11, 13, 14; 7:53; 18:13–15; 21:20–28; 23:29; 25:8; 28:17), but he does not juxtapose the Mosaic law with non-Jewish traditions. In short, Luke does not revise his concept of the Mosaic law to present it as a superior alternative to other forms of legislation within the Greco-Roman world nor does he transform it into a set of moral guidelines that appeal to Greek notions of virtue and piety, or to the concept of a universal law.

3.5 CONCLUSION

Although Luke writes within a Hellenistic historiographical tradition, his appropriation of the Jewish scriptures does not appear to serve the same aim as that of early Jewish and Christian apologists. There is neither explicit nor implicit evidence to suggest that Luke emphasizes the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures in order to demonstrate the legitimacy of the Christ-believing community in relation to Greco-Roman competitors. Surely Luke does attempt to show that Christ-believers truly understand the Jewish scriptures, rather than non-Christ-believing Jews, and this strategy can be labeled as “apologetic” insofar as it aims to defend Christ-believers in relation to outsiders to their com-

On the one hand, Luke can report instances that demonstrate how Jesus and Christ-believers show respect for the Mosaic code (e.g., Luke 5:12–16; 17:11–19) but, on the other, he refers to the Mosaic law as “a yoke that neither our ancestors nor we have been able to bear” (Acts 15:10) and to its inability to provide justification (Acts 13:38–39). Furthermore, in some instances, Luke presents the authority of Jesus as greater than that of the Mosaic law. For example, in Luke 6:1–5, Jesus asserts his authority to allow his disciples to pick heads of grain on the Sabbath by arguing that “the Son of Man is lord of the Sabbath” (Luke 6:5). Some scholars of Luke-Acts have interpreted the references to the fidelity of Jewish Christ-believers to Mosaic law in Luke-Acts as evidence that Luke regards the Mosaic law as valid for Jews. See, e.g., Jacob Jervell, “The Law in Luke-Acts,” *HTR* 64 (1971): 21–36; Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 110–30. Others argue, however, that Luke presents the Mosaic law as valid only until the coming of Christ. See, e.g., Max B. Turner, “The Sabbath, Sunday, and the Law in Luke-Acts” in *From Sabbath to Lord’s Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation* (ed. D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), 99–158; Craig Blomberg, “The Law in Luke-Acts,” *JSNT* 22 (1984): 53–80; M. A. Seifrid, “Jesus and the Law in Acts,” *JSNT* 30 (1987): 39–57. For a more comprehensive discussion of Luke’s treatment of the Mosaic law, see S. G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (SNTSMS 50; Cambridge: CUP, 1983).

munity. Nevertheless, the contexts in which he situates this type of competition make it differ significantly from appeals to the scriptures that occur in the writings of early apologists.

In contrast to the appropriation of the Jewish scriptures by early apologists, Luke never once juxtaposes these texts with non-Jewish traditions nor does he attempt to show that they are more ancient than or superior to other writings. Moreover, he does not present the exegesis of Christ-believers as a form of philosophical inquiry and his writings show no evidence of an attempt to present the Mosaic law as a superior or universal form of legislation. The complete absence of these strategies provides us with little reason to conclude that Luke uses the Jewish scriptures to define Christ-believers with reference to their wider Greco-Roman environment. Rather than describing the antiquity of the Jewish scriptures in relation to non-Jewish traditions, Luke depicts a competition between Christ-believers and other Jews for primacy over the same sacred texts. This approach more narrowly resembles the self-defining strategies of the early Jewish apocalyptic groups who laid claim to the Jewish scriptures as part of a struggle for recognition within an inner-Jewish context.

Justin, like Luke, argues that Christ-believers possess an exclusive understanding of the Jewish scriptures as part of an attempt to define their privileged status in relation to Jews. Yet, unlike Luke, he also asserts the antiquity and superiority of the Jewish scriptures over non-Jewish traditions and presents the exegesis of Christ-believers as a form of philosophical inquiry that rivals Greco-Roman philosophy. Furthermore, he presents the ethical requirements of the Mosaic law as an exemplary guide to Greek piety and as a type of legislation that has eternal, or universal, relevance. Clearly, these interpretive strategies stand squarely within the exegetical tradition forged by early Jewish and Christian apologists, who appealed to the Jewish scriptures to defend or gain recognition for their communities within the Roman Empire; but they differ significantly from the representations of the Jewish scriptures and scriptural interpretation in the writings of Luke.

PART TWO

THE RECIPIENTS OF SCRIPTURAL PROMISES

INTRODUCTION TO PART TWO

In the first part of my study, I explored the way that Luke and Justin lay claim to the Jewish scriptures for Christ-believers by describing their authoritative ability to interpret these texts and, in the case of Justin, by asserting that the Jewish scriptures were an authoritative source of truth that rivaled Greco-Roman traditions. In this section of my study, I will compare their attempts to claim the Jewish scriptures for the Christ-believing community by representing this group as the beneficiary of scriptural promises. Such an avenue of inquiry will involve a consideration of their depictions of the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers as an eschatological gift that fulfills end-time scriptural predictions (Chapter Four) and an evaluation of their portrayal of Christ-believers as recipients of scriptural promises that were originally made to the Jewish people (Chapter Five).

CHAPTER FOUR

REVELATION AT THE END OF THE AGE

4.1 INTRODUCTION

As noted in Chapter One, certain early Jewish groups present their knowledge and scriptural interpretation as an eschatological gift.¹ This type of description demonstrates the elect status of these early Jewish communities: as the chosen people of God, they receive revelatory knowledge and so participate in the blessings of the final stages of history. A similar strategy also finds expression in the writings of Luke and Justin. Both authors portray the inspired understanding of the Jewish scriptures as an end-time gift that Christ-believers receive.² In so doing, they present the Christ-believing community as the group that receives the fulfillment of long-awaited scriptural promises. Moreover, by linking the exegesis of the community to the realization of scriptural predictions, Luke and Justin provide scriptural justification for their assertion

¹ For example, 1 En. 90:20–38 portrays the enlightenment of some Jews as a revelation of the proper meaning of the Mosaic law that the elect receive at the end of the age; the *maskilim* of Daniel represent an enlightened group who gain access to the revelation of end-time events and to the interpretation of prophecy that Daniel had earlier recorded (Dan 11:33, 35; 12:3, 10); 1QpHab 7 presents the scriptural interpretation of the Righteous Teacher as a revelation of how the prophecies of Habakkuk would be fulfilled for the “last generation”; and 1QS 8:11–16 portrays the scriptural interpretation of the community as the fulfillment of Isa 40:3. Similarly, 1QH^a presents the community as a group that had already begun to enjoy the privileges of the eschatological age (e.g., 1QH^a 14:13–14; 19:12–14) and as recipients of divine revelatory knowledge (e.g., 1QH^a 10:10–18; 12:6, 27; 15:19–26; 17:31–32).

² For Luke, the resurrection and ascension of Christ, the mission of the apostles and Paul, and the sending of the Spirit are events that mark the beginning of the reign of Christ and the initial signs of the final age (e.g., Luke 24:44–49; Acts 1:8; 2:17–36; 13:46–47; 26:12–23), even though he certainly anticipates a more complete renewal in the future (e.g., Acts 3:17–26). For Justin, the first coming of Christ and the subsequent proclamation of the apostles represent an initial realization of end-time prophecies. Although he expects a future, more complete fulfillment at Christ’s second coming (see, e.g., *Dial.* 14.8; 31.1; 34.2; 36.1; 49.2; 110.2; 121.3; *1 Apol.* 52.3), Justin regards the proclamation of the apostles, and its effects, as a manifestation of the beginning of Christ’s reign in the present (see, e.g., *1 Apol.* 39.1–5; 45.5; *Dial.* 109.1–110.6; 121.3–122.6).

that this group alone possesses an authoritative understanding of the Jewish scriptures.

Even as Luke and Justin aim to show the legitimacy of the exegesis of Christ-believers in this way, so they appeal to the Jewish scriptures to provide an explanation for the rejection of their message and exegesis: those who do not accept their preaching and scriptural interpretation are seen as the recipients of prophetic oracles of judgment. For Franz Overbeck, this parallel between Luke and Justin represents a common “antijudaistische” use of scripture and furnishes proof for his conclusion that the writings of Luke and Justin arose out of common non-Jewish theological circles. He maintains that both authors appeal to prophetic warnings of judgment to support their common view that Jews had become darkened in unbelief.³ Despite this similarity between Luke and Justin, I will argue that each author provides a different type of rationale for the common assertion that the revelatory knowledge of Christ-believers and the “darkening” of their opponents represent the fulfillment of scriptural promises. This difference shows an important distinction between their respective depictions of the identity of the Christ-believing community.

In what follows, I will explore the way that Luke and Justin each present the exegetical revelation of Christ-believers, on the one hand, and the darkening of outsiders, on the other, as evidence that the end-time promises of God are coming to fulfillment. This will entail a comparison of the following elements of their writings: 1) their common attempt to present the ability of Christ-believers to understand the Jewish scriptures as the realization of end-time promises; 2) their similar use of scriptural oracles of judgment to validate their conclusions

³ According to F. Overbeck, “Ueber das Verhältniss Justins des Martyrers zur Apg,” *ZWT* 15 (1872): 339–43, both Acts and Justin contrast non-Jewish belief with Jewish unbelief and use Isa 6:10 to support this view. He argues that Luke applies the Jewish prophets in an anti-Jewish way in Acts 7:49ff; 13:47; 28:26ff and maintains that this closely parallels the perspective of Justin (e.g., *Dialogue* 12, 19–24, 39, 93, 131–133). Similarly, both Richard I. Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2006), 326–7, 345–6, and Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 59–60, 128–9, have more recently argued that Luke affirms the continuity between the Jewish scriptures and Christ-believers while simultaneously emphasizing the infidelity of Jews in order to distance the Christ-believing community from contemporary Jews. For both Pervo and Tyson, this characteristic of Luke-Acts shows that the author lived in a time when a clear separation between Christianity and Judaism had already taken place in the past.

about the “darkened” status of outsiders to the Christ-believing community; 3) their differing configurations of the distinction between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community; and 4) their differing uses of prophetic traditions to provide the rationale for this division.

4.2 END-TIME REVELATION AND DARKENING IN LUKE-ACTS

4.2.1 *Luke and the Witnesses*

Scholars often note how Luke casts the first disciples and Paul in the role of the servant, or witness, that Isaiah 40–55 describes (Luke 24:44–49; Acts 1:8; 13:46–47; 26:12–23),⁴ or they discuss his particular emphasis upon scriptural interpretation in such contexts.⁵ To my knowledge, however, no one has pointed out the way that Luke presents their revelatory exegesis as part of the restoration and illumination that Isaiah foretells (e.g., Isa 42:6–7; 49:6).

In Luke 24:44–49, as we have seen, Luke presents scriptural interpretation as a central element of the post-resurrection teachings of Christ and of the subsequent mission of his followers. Richard Dillon argues that the phrase ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων (Luke 24:48) describes “the risen Christ’s self-disclosure *through the interpretation of the*

⁴ See, e.g., Thomas Moore, “The Lucan Great Commission and the Isaianic Servant,” *BibSac* (1997): 47–60; cf. Jacques Dupont, “La portée christologique de l’évangélisation des nations d’après Luc 24, 47” in *Neues Testament und Kirche für Rudolf Schnackenburg [z. 60. Geburtsag am 5. Jan. 1974 von Freunden u. Kollegen gewidmet]* (ed. Rudolf Schnackenburg and Joachim Gnllka; Freiburg: Herder, 1974), 136–7; D. L. Tiede, “The Exaltation of Jesus and the Restoration of Israel in Acts 1,” *HTR* 79 (1986): 285–6; Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness* (Sheffield: SAP, 1996), 343; Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986–1990), 1:297; I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 906. For a discussion of the use of Isa 49:6 in Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8; 13:46–47; 26:12–23, see David Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (WUNT 130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 84–101.

⁵ See, e.g., Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York: MacMillan, 1927), 303–8; P. Schubert, “The Structure and Significance of Luke 24,” in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag am 20. August 1954* (BZNW 21; ed. W. Eltester; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954), 176–86; Richard J. Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24* (AB 82; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 203–20; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 206; C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–1998), 1:79.

scriptures” [italics mine] and “becomes the mandated ‘ministry of the word.’”⁶ The context of Luke 24:48 strongly suggests that τούτων refers to two elements that would comprise the content of the testimony of the disciples: the resurrection of Christ and his explanation of how he fulfilled the scriptures.⁷ Yet the identification of the disciples as μάρτυρες in Luke 24:48 (cf. Acts 1:8) also highlights the wider significance of their mission and message. By describing the disciples as “witnesses” (μάρτυρες) in Luke 24:48 and Acts 1:8,⁸ and indicating that they would proclaim their message “to the end of the earth” (ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς) in Acts 1:8, Luke recalls LXX Isa 43:10–12 (γένεσθέ μοι μάρτυρες . . . ὑμεῖς ἐμοὶ μάρτυρες)⁹ and LXX Isa 49:6 (ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς).¹⁰ These passages from Isaiah outline the role of the servant

⁶ Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 169; cf. Jürgen Roloff, *Apostolat-Verkündigung-Kirche. Ursprung, Inhalt und Funktion des kirchlichen Apostelamtes nach Paulus, Lukas und den Pastoralbriefen* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965), 191.

⁷ Immediately prior to the commissioning of the eleven as witnesses, Jesus proves that he has risen from the dead (Luke 24:36–43), explains how he has fulfilled the scriptures (Luke 24:44, 46–47), and opens their minds to understand the scriptures (Luke 24:45). John Nolland, *Luke* (WBC 35; 3 vols.; Dallas: Word Books, 1989–1993), 3:1220, rightly argues that “from the immediate context, we can infer that the disciples are directed to witness because they have experienced and are therefore in a position to testify about (i) the pre-passion teaching of Jesus with its emphasis on the fulfillment of Scripture in reference to himself; (ii) the post-resurrection illumination of the Scriptures by the risen Lord; (iii) the passion events themselves; (iv) the reality of Jesus’ resurrected state; (v) the need for universal proclamation of the message of forgiveness in Jesus’ name . . . and (vi) the need to begin this proclamation in Jerusalem” (1220).

⁸ Luke refers to the disciples and Paul as “witnesses” on a number of occasions (Luke 24:48; Acts 1:8, 22; 2:32; 3:15; 5:32; 10:39, 41; 13:31; 22:15, 20; 26:16). Although he does not always allude to their role in fulfilling the promises of Isaiah in these contexts, and sometimes refers more broadly to those who were witnesses of the resurrection (e.g., Acts 2:32; 3:15; 5:32; 13:31), Luke appears to use the term “witnesses” in Luke 24:48; Acts 1:8, 22; 10:39, 41, to identify the disciples as those who fulfilled promises from Isaiah that refer to Israel as the “witness” or “servant” of YHWH.

⁹ Barrett, *Acts*, 1:79, attributes the references to the disciples as μάρτυρες in Acts 1:8 (cf. Luke 24:48) to an allusion to LXX Isa 43:10; cf. Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 92–3. Tiede, “Exaltation,” 278–86, argues that Acts 1:8 (cf. Luke 24:48) alludes to Isa 49:6 with the purpose of depicting the “renewal of the vocation of Israel to be a light to the nations and to the end of the earth” (286); cf. Turner, *Power*, 36–7, 300–2, 342–4, 420–1. Turner suggests that, in Acts 1:8, Luke depicts the imminent descent of the Spirit as a prophetic endowment that enables the disciples to fulfill the role of the servant of the Lord described in Isaiah (Isa 49:6).

¹⁰ Since the phrase ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς is quite rare (5x in LXX: Isa 8:9; 48:20; 49:6; 62:11; Pss. Sol. 1:4; cf. Acts 1:8 and 13:47), and since a direct citation of Isa 49:6 occurs in Acts 13:47, it is most probable that Acts 1:8 draws upon Isa 49:6. So Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:17; cf. Richard Bauckham, “The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts,” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (JSJSup 72; ed. James Scott; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 475; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 85–6.

of YHWH who brings restoration to Israel and light to the nations (cf. LXX Isa 42:1–6).¹¹ By alluding to these themes from Isaiah in Luke 24:48 and Acts 1:8, not only does Luke cast the first disciples in the role of the witness, or servant, that Isaiah foretells;¹² he also indicates that their declaration of the resurrection of Christ and his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures would be the means by which they would effect a long-awaited restoration of Israel and illumination of the nations. Through their message and scriptural interpretation, the disciples both receive and participate in the fulfillment of Isaianic promises.

Luke also appears to portray the scriptural interpretation of Philip (Acts 8:26–40) in a similar way. Scholars frequently suggest that the scene of the Ethiopian's return from Jerusalem worship (Acts 8:27) evokes a recollection of the eschatological image found in Isa 56:3–5.¹³ Although Deut 23:1 indicates that a sexually mutilated man could not enter "the assembly of the LORD," the prophecy from Isa 56:3–6 announces that this type of individual would have a special place in the house of the LORD at the time of Israel's restoration.¹⁴ If Luke here

¹¹ Luke 24:49 also links the descent of the Spirit with Isaianic promises by indicating that Jesus commanded the disciples to "wait in the city until you are clothed with power from on high" (ὁμεῖς δὲ καθίστατε ἐν τῇ πόλει ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δύναντων), a phrase that appears to recall LXX Isa 32:15a (ἕως ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ἔφ' ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ἀφ' ὕψους). So Turner, *Power*, 300–1.

¹² As Tiede, "Exaltation," 286, has argued, "The logic stems directly from Second Isaiah: the promise of God's reign is not simply the restoration of the preserved of Israel, but the renewal of the vocation of Israel to be a light to the nations to the end of the earth"; cf. James M. Scott, "Acts 2:9–11 as an Anticipation of the Mission to the Nations," in *The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles* (ed. Jostein Ådna and Hans Kvalbein; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 109.

¹³ A. F. Loisy, *Les Actes des apôtres* (Paris: Emile Nourry, 1920), 377; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 410; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts* (ECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 342; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP 5; Collegeville, Liturgical Press, 1992), 155, 158–9; Marshall, *Acts*, 162; Stephen G. Wilson, *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts* (SNTSMS 23; Cambridge: CUP, 1973), 171–2; David P. Moessner, "The Script of the Scriptures in Acts: Suffering as God's 'Plan' (βουλή) for the World for the 'Release of Sins,'" in *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed. Ben Witherington III; New York: CUP, 1996), 231–2; Mikeal C. Parsons, "Isaiah 53 in Acts 8: A Reply to Professor Morna Hooker," in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant* (ed. William H. Bellinger, Jr. and William R. Farmer; Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1998), 111–3; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 141–2.

¹⁴ The term εὐνοῦχος (Hebrew = סריס) can refer to a castrated man or a person who holds a high political office. Some suggest that since Luke also describes the Ethiopian as a court official and treasurer for Candace, the queen of Ethiopia (δυνάστης Κανδάκης βασιλίσσης Αἰθιοπῶν, ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γᾶς αὐτῆς), it would be redundant to use εὐνοῦχος to depict his role as an official. For this reason, they suggest that the term εὐνοῦχος in Acts 8 probably refers to genital mutilation. See, e.g., Marshall, *Acts*, 162;

wishes to portray the Ethiopian official as a eunuch who experiences the fulfillment of Isa 56:3–5, he does so in a novel way.¹⁵ Rather than becoming a full participant in the Temple worship in Jerusalem, as the prophecy suggests, the Ethiopian gains access to God and his end-time salvation through a revelation of the true meaning of the Jewish scriptures. In the words of Darrell Bock, this episode in Acts signals that “the hope of worship expressed in Isa 56 is beginning to take place.”¹⁶ As such, it serves as another example of how Luke presents the proclamation and positive reception of the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers as a form of participation in the fulfillment of end-time Isaianic promises.

Luke also alludes to passages from Isaiah to demonstrate how the preaching of Paul effects restoration for Israel and light for the nations. In Acts 13:46–47, for example, Luke has Paul and Barnabas cite and interpret Isa 49:6b to describe their mission to non-Jews:¹⁷

Johnson, *Acts*, 155. Parsons, “Isaiah 53 in Acts 8,” 108–9, notes that his position as an official for royalty makes it probable that the Ethiopian was castrated, since males in this type of role were often castrated (see, e.g., Herodotus, 8.105; Esther 2:3, 14; 4:4–5). Parsons further notes that the repeated use of the term εὐνοῦχος (Acts 8:27, 34, 36, 38, 39) to describe the Ethiopian suggests that his physical condition, rather than his role as a court official (δυνάστης), is the point of emphasis for Luke.

¹⁵ Although the ethno-religious status of the Ethiopian remains ambiguous in Acts 8, it seems probable that Luke wants to present him as a marginal figure in relation to Judaism. If he was a non-Jew, his participation in Judaism would most certainly be limited. If he was a Jew with mutilated genitals, he could not have participated fully in the Temple cult (Acts 8:27; Deut 23:1). Wilson, *Gentile Mission*, 171, maintains that the Ethiopian was a proselyte since Luke presents Cornelius as the first non-Jewish convert (Acts 10–11, 15; see especially Acts 15:14). Similarly, Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 410, regards the eunuch as a Jew, or at least as a proselyte; cf. Henry J. Cadbury, “The Hellenists,” in *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles* (ed. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; London: MacMillan, 1920–1933), 5:66; Johnson, *Acts*, 159. Against this view, F. Scott Spencer, *The Portrait of Philip in Acts: A Study of Roles and Relations* (JSNTSup 67; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 172, asserts that the eunuch was a non-Jew; cf. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:110; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:425–6; Loisy, *Actes*, 377. Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 314, suggests that Luke intentionally leaves the precise identity of the Ethiopian ambiguous.

¹⁶ Bock, *Acts*, 342.

¹⁷ Some scholars attempt to argue that Acts 13:46–47 presents Christ as the “servant of the Lord” foretold by Isaiah. See, e.g., Pierre Grelot, “Note sur Actes, XIII, 47,” *RB* 88 (1981): 368–72; Jacques Dupont, *Nouvelles études sur les Actes des apôtres* (LD 118; Paris: Cerf, 1984), 345–9. The majority maintain, however, that Acts 13:46–47 applies this role to Paul and Barnabas. See, e.g., Haenchen, *Acts*, 414; J. Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 41–61; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 106; Marshall, *Acts*, 230.

παρρησιασάμενοι τε ὁ Παῦλος καὶ ὁ Βαρναβᾶς εἶπαν, Ὑμῖν ἦν ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον λαληθῆναι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐπειδὴ ἀπωθεῖσθε αὐτὸν καὶ οὐκ ἄξιους κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, ἰδοὺ στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη. οὕτως γὰρ ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος, Τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς. ἀκούοντα δὲ τὰ ἔθνη ἔχαιρον καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζῶν ἁγιῶν· διεφέρετο δὲ ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου δι' ὅλης τῆς χώρας.

Then both Paul and Barnabas spoke boldly and said: "It was necessary for the word of God to be spoken first to you (Jews). Since you reject it and judge yourselves to be unworthy of eternal life, behold we are turning to the nations. For so the Lord has commanded us, 'I have appointed you as a light for the nations, so that you may bring salvation to the end of the earth.'"¹⁸ When the nations heard this, they were glad and glorified the word of the Lord; and as many as had been appointed to eternal life believed. So the word of the Lord spread throughout the region. (Acts 13:46–49)

In this context, Luke refers to the message of Paul and Barnabas as ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (τοῦ κυρίου). The phrase recalls the sermon that Paul preached on the previous Sabbath in the synagogue at Pisidia of Antioch (Acts 13:16–41).¹⁹ In this earlier sermon, Paul cites and interprets the Jewish scriptures to demonstrate how Christ, through his death and resurrection, fulfilled them. By having Paul and Barnabas subsequently declare that they would take this same message to non-Jews, Luke indicates that they will effect the illumination of the nations that Isaiah promises by proclaiming how the scriptures have been fulfilled through Christ.

Again, in Acts 26:12–23, Luke presents Paul's mission as the fulfillment of Isaianic promises of restoration and illumination:

¹⁸ The phrase "for a covenant of a race" (εἰς διαθήκην γένους) does not appear in Acts 13:47b, but is present in some manuscript traditions of LXX Isa 49:6b. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 521, suggests that this difference represents the removal of a reference to Jewish people in Acts; cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:657. As Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 96–7, points out, however, the same part of Isa 49:6b is also omitted from the Alexandrian manuscript group of the LXX (i.e., A; Q; 26; 86; 106; 710), and has no equivalent in the MT. Therefore, it is possible that Luke relied on a Greek version of the Jewish scriptures that did not include "for a covenant of a race" (εἰς διαθήκην γένους); cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1988), 315.

¹⁹ Since, in Acts 13:26, Paul refers to his message as ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας and, in Acts 13:44, Luke indicates that the whole city gathered to hear τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου on the following Sabbath, we can infer that the phrase τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ in Acts 13:46 refers back to the sermon in Acts 13:16–41.

Ἐν οἷς πορευόμενος εἰς τὴν Δαμασκὸν μετ' ἐξουσίας καὶ ἐπιτροπῆς τῆς τῶν ἀρχιερέων ἡμέρας μέσης κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν εἶδον, βασιλεῦ, οὐρανόθεν ὑπὲρ τὴν λαμπρότητα τοῦ ἡλίου περιλάμπαν με φῶς καὶ τοὺς σὺν ἐμοὶ πορευομένους. πάντων τε καταπεσόντων ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἤκουσα φωνὴν λέγουσαν πρὸς με τῇ Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ, Σαοὺλ Σαοὺλ, τί με διώκεις; σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν. ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπα, Τίς εἰ, κύριε; ὁ δὲ κύριος εἶπεν, Ἐγὼ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὃν σὺ διώκεις. ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι καὶ στήθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὤφθην σοι, προχειρίσασθαί σε ὑπηρετήν καὶ μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδές [με] ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι, ἐξαιρούμενός σε ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰς οὓς ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε ἀνοίξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν, τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς ἅφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ κληρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμέ... ἕνεκα τούτων με Ἰουδαῖοι συλλαβόμενοι [ὄντα] ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐπειρῶντο διαχειρίσασθαι. ἐπικουρίας οὖν τυχὼν τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης ἔστηκα μαρτυρούμενος μικρῷ τε καὶ μεγάλῳ οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγων ὧν τε οἱ προφῆται ἐλάλησαν μελλόντων γίνεσθαι καὶ Μωϋσῆς, εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός, εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μέλλει καταγγέλειν τῷ τε λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

In this connection, I was going to Damascus with the authority and commission of the chief priests, when at midday along the road, O king, I saw a light from heaven, brighter than the sun, shining around me and those journeying with me. When we had all fallen to the ground, I heard a voice saying to me in the Hebrew language, "Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me? It is hard for you to kick against the goads." And I said, "Who are you, Lord?" And the Lord said, "I am Jesus whom you are persecuting. But rise and stand on your feet; for I have appeared to you for this purpose, to appoint you as a servant and witness to the things in which you have seen [me] and to those in which I will appear to you. I will rescue you from the people and from the nations to whom I am sending you to open their eyes so that they may turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God, so that they may receive forgiveness of sins and a place among those who are sanctified by faith in me."... For this reason Jews seized me in the temple and tried to kill me. To this day I have had help from God, and so I stand here, testifying to both small and great, saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses said was going to happen: that the Messiah must suffer, and that, by being the first to rise from the dead, he would proclaim light both to the people and to the nations.
(Acts 26:12-23)

Although the Lukan Paul declares that Christ was the first to proclaim "light" to the Jewish people and the nations (cf. Luke 2:32; Isa 42:6; 49:6), he also alludes to promises from Isa 42:6-7 and 49:6 to describe his own mission. He presents his initial encounter with Christ as a revelation of light, reports that he was commissioned to open the eyes of both Jews and non-Jews, and recounts his appointment as a witness of the Lord

(cf. Acts 9:15; 13:46–47; 22:15).²⁰ By further explaining that he fulfilled this mission by declaring what the prophets and Moses predicted (26:22–23), the Lukan Paul indicates that his scriptural exposition functioned as a primary means of effecting illumination.²¹ Luke thus presents Paul as a type of servant or witness, like the figure that Isaiah 42:6–7 and 49:6 describes, and his message and exegesis as the mediation of restoration and light that such passages from Isaiah foretell.²² Luke thus shows the legitimacy of the revelatory exegesis of Paul by presenting it as the realization of end-time promises.

4.2.2 “You Will Indeed Look but Never Perceive”

Besides depicting the message and exegesis of Christ-believers as an eschatological revelation, Luke appeals to the Jewish scriptures to justify the denunciation of those who do not understand, or reject, their

²⁰ The phrases ἀνοίξει ὁφθαλμούς and ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς appear to allude to Isa 42:7, 16. So Haenchen, *Acts*, 686; Conzelmann, *Acts*, 211; Marshall, *Acts*, 396–7; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 760; Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light: Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament* (Overtures to Biblical Theology; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 85. The use of the term “witness” (μάρτυς) for Paul in Acts 26:16 further identifies him with Isaianic promises (Isa 43:10, 12; 44:8). Dennis Hamm, “Paul’s Blindness and Healing: Clues to Symbolic Intent (Acts 9, 22 and 26),” *Bib* 70 (1990): 63–7, describes the intent of Acts 26:23 in the following way: “the light that Paul experiences (that opened his eyes and moved him out of spiritual darkness) became the light that he mediated to others (opening their eyes).”

²¹ The description of the message of Paul in Acts 26:22–23 also recalls Luke 24:44–47. For further discussion of this parallel, see Dupont, “La portée christologique,” 141–3; idem, *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (trans. John R. Keating; New York: Paulist, 1979), 145–6; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 89.

²² Although Turner, *Power*, 343, 402, 432, suggests that Luke depicts the first disciples, in particular, as witnesses who bring the restoration of Israel and the light to the nations that Isaiah promised, other Jewish Christ-believers appear to take up a similar role, even though Luke does not appeal to passages from Isaiah when describing them. In Acts 7–8, for example, Stephen and Philip proclaim the message of Christ in a manner similar to that of the apostles, and in Acts 13 both Paul and Barnabas declare that they are fulfilling the role of the servant that Isa 49:6 describes. Furthermore, as Karl A. Kuhn, “Beginning the Witness: The αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρεταὶ of Luke’s Infancy Narrative,” *NTS* 49 (2003): 237–55, has recently argued, the figures in Luke 1–2 undergo a transformation parallel to that of the disciples in Luke 24; as a result of receiving a manifestation of God’s salvation in Christ, these early figures also become witnesses of his salvation. Kuhn suggests that the phrase αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρεταὶ γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου reflects a pattern throughout Luke-Acts “in which individual characters are confronted with the reality of God’s in-breaking reign in Jesus and respond in praise and in testimony” (254). If Kuhn’s conclusions are correct, Luke may implicitly extend the role of the servant that Isaiah describes to all Jews who perceive and respond positively to the revelation of Christ.

exegetical conclusions. In Luke 8:10, for example, the Lukan Jesus cites an excerpt from LXX Isa 6:9–10 to support his distinction between those who possess the ability to know “the mysteries of the kingdom of God” and those who do not.²³

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς, ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν.

And he said, “To you it has been given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but to the others in parables, in order that ‘seeing they may not perceive, and hearing they may not understand’” (Isa 6:9–10).²⁴ (Luke 8:10)

By retaining the Markan ἵνα (Mark 4:12; Luke 8:10b) rather than changing it to ὅτι as Matthew does (Matt 13:13), Luke indicates that Jesus gave the disciples the capacity to know the “mysteries of the kingdom” but spoke in parables “to the others” with the express purpose of ensuring that the latter group would not perceive their true meaning.²⁵ The

²³ In contrast to the darkened state of “the others” (τοῖς λοιποῖς), the disciples receive the ability to know the mysteries of the kingdom. Compare the phrase ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ in Luke 8:10 (cf. Matt 13:11) with ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ in Mark 4:11. As Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (AB 28, 28A; 2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1981–1985), 1:707–8, notes, Luke and Matthew both describe “God’s gift to the disciples as a cognitive experience of the kingdom” (707).

²⁴ Note the longer citation of Isa 6:9–10 in the parallel account in Matt 13:14–15, and the slightly longer version of the citation in Mark 4:12. Although Luke only cites a small excerpt of Isa 6:9–10 in Luke 8:10, his lengthier citation in Acts 28:26–27 demonstrates the significance of this Isaiah passage to his narrative and thought. Virtually the same form of the citation of LXX Isa 6:9–10 occurs in Matt 13:14–15 and Acts 28:25–28.

²⁵ The meaning of ἵνα in this context is debated, since it is difficult to distinguish whether it indicates purpose or result. For example, I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 323, argues that the citation from Isa 6:9–10 suggests that the ἵνα expresses the meaning: “so that the scripture is fulfilled which says that.” By contrast, Craig E. Evans, *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6:9–10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation* (JSNTSup 64; Sheffield: SAP, 1989), 117, suggests that Luke’s use of γνῶναι as an infinitive of purpose in the previous clause stands “roughly parallel” to the ἵνα in Luke 8:10. This leads him to conclude that both clauses denote purpose: “To you it has been given (in order that you may) know..., but to the rest (it has been given) in parables in order that seeing they should not see...”; cf. J. Gnllka, *Die Verstockung Israels. Isaias 6,9–10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker* (SANT 3; München: Kösel, 1961), 45–8. Whether Jesus spoke in parables to “the others” in order that they might not understand, or with the result that they fail to understand, the essential difference between these two interpretations is barely distinguishable. If we take the ἵνα to mean “with the result that,” it is still the case that the Lukan (and Markan) Jesus deliberately

citation of Isa 6:9–10 justifies this distinction by showing the misunderstanding of those who did not perceive the message of Jesus to be congruent with the description of those who misunderstood, or rejected, the message of the prophet Isaiah.

Although Luke does not here clearly describe the referent of “the mysteries of the kingdom of God,” his emphasis upon the knowledge of the kingdom and his identification of the seed as “the word of God” suggests that the gift of knowledge that the disciples receive includes the correct interpretation of the scriptures. Because Luke identifies the seed as “the word of God” (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ) in his version of the parable of the sower,²⁶ his description of receiving the knowledge of the kingdom exerts a wider, thematic influence in his narrative.²⁷ Through the repetition of this phraseology, Luke creates a link between the parable of the sower and subsequent scenes that describe the growth of “the word of God” in Acts (e.g., Acts 6:7; 12:24; 19:20).²⁸ In these latter contexts, the early Christ-believing community represents the good soil upon which the word fell and took root. That is, “the word of God” functions as the creative force that causes the growth of the church.²⁹

chose to speak in parables to “the others” even though he knew that this action would produce the outcome of misunderstanding. Thus, whether we interpret the ἵνα as purpose or result, the context in Luke, and Mark, suggests that Jesus intended to conceal the mysteries of the kingdom from people who were not his disciples.

²⁶ Compare with Mark 4:13–20 (ὁ λόγος) and Matt 13:18–23 (ὁ λόγος and ὁ λόγος τῆς βασιλείας).

²⁷ William C. Robinson, Jr., “On Preaching the Word of God,” in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert* (ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn; New York: Abingdon, 1966), 132, notes Luke’s emphasis upon “the word of God” in the parable of the sower and argues that this adaptation of the parable has the effect of applying it to the preaching of the church.

²⁸ Note the repetition of the phrases ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἤρξανεν καὶ ἐπληθύνετο in Acts 6:7, ὁ δὲ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἤρξανεν καὶ ἐπληθύνετο in Acts 12:24, and τοῦ κυρίου ὁ λόγος ἤρξανεν καὶ ἴσχυεν in Acts 19:20. This terminology corresponds to ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ in Luke 8:11 and to the metaphor of growth and multiplication of the seed in the parable of the sower.

²⁹ Jerome Kodell, “‘The Word of God Grew’: The Ecclesial Tendency of the Λόγος in Acts 1:7; 12:24; 19:20,” *Bib* 55 (1974): 505–20, argues that the parable of the sower inspired Luke’s emphasis on the growth of the word in Acts 6:7; 12:24; 19:20; cf. J. Dupont, “La parabole du semeur dans la version de Luc,” in *Apophoreta: Festschrift für E. Haenchen* (ed. W. Eltester et F. H. Kettler; BZNW 30; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1964), 97–108; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:82. See also François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years of Research (1959–2005)* (2nd ed., rev.; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 271, 459, who argues that Acts portrays the incipience and growth of the Jesus movement as the story of the “diffusion of the Word” (271). Kodell maintains that Luke made ὁ λόγος in Acts 6:7, 12:24, and 19:20 “involve the meaning of ‘church’ or ‘community’” (518), in part, because the accompanying verbs

Since Luke uses the phrases ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου, and ὁ λόγος to refer to proclamations that focus upon scriptural interpretation and produce this type of growth (e.g., Acts 2:41; 4:4; 13:5, 15, 26, 44, 46, 48, 49; 17:11, 13; 18:5, 11; 19:8–10), we can infer that his differentiation between those who perceive the mysteries of the kingdom and those who do not in Luke 8:10 also points forward to a distinction between those who receive and reject the message and exegesis of the followers of Jesus. The appeal to Isa 6:9–10 to denounce those who are not disciples in Luke 8:10 therefore also applies to those who reject the message and scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers in subsequent reports of the proclamation of “the word of God.”

Similarly, the more lengthy citation of LXX Isa 6:9–10 in Acts 28:26–28 functions as a scriptural warrant for the exclusion of those who reject the scriptural interpretation of Paul. Prior to citing Isa 6:9–10, the Lukan Paul testifies about “the kingdom of God” to Jews in Rome and tries “to convince them about Jesus both from the law of Moses and from the prophets” (Acts 28:23).³⁰ When division ensues as a result of his message and exegesis (Acts 28:24–25), Paul explains the condition of those who reject his preaching in the following way:

Καλῶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησεν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν λέγων, Πορεύθητι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ εἰπόν, Ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδῃτε· ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου καὶ τοῖς ὤσιν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμυσαν· μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς

αὐξάνω and πληθύνω in these summaries allude to the growth and expansion of the people of God in the LXX (Gen 1:22, 28; 8:17; 9:1, 7; 17:20; 28:3; 35:11; 47:27; 48:4; Ex 1:7; Lev 26:9; Jer 3:16); cf. Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 167–71. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:82, rightly distinguishes between the growth of the word and the growth of the church by explaining that, for Luke, the proclamation of the message of Jesus (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ) is the creative force behind the growth of the church. Although the growth of the word produces the growth of the church, these are still two distinct concepts.

³⁰ The syntax of Acts 28:23 makes it difficult to determine whether Luke intends to present Paul’s scriptural interpretation as an elaboration of his testimony about the kingdom or to portray his testimony about the kingdom and his exegesis of scripture as two different parts of his message: Ταξάμενοι δὲ αὐτῷ ἡμέραν ἤλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ξενίαν πλείονες οἷς ἐξετίθετο διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, πείθων τε αὐτοὺς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τε τοῦ νόμου Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, ἀπὸ πρῶτῃ ἕως ἑσπέρας. If we take πείθων τε αὐτοὺς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τε τοῦ νόμου Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν as an appositional phrase, then we would conclude the former. Alternatively, if we read διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ and πείθων τε αὐτοὺς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τε τοῦ νόμου Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν as coordinate participle phrases that indicate two different parts of his message, we would conclude the latter.

καὶ τοῖς ὡσὶν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν, καὶ ἰάσονται αὐτούς.

The Holy Spirit rightly spoke to your ancestors through the prophet Isaiah, saying “Go to this people and say, you will indeed listen, but never understand, and you will indeed look, but never perceive. For the heart of this people has become dull, and with their ears they barely hear, and they have closed their eyes; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart and turn, and I would heal them” (Isa 6:9–10).
(Acts 28:25b–27)

Paul thus cites Isa 6:9–10 to provide a scriptural explanation for the failure of some Jews to believe, or understand, his exposition of the Jewish scriptures. Whereas in Luke 8:10, LXX Isa 6:9–10 appears to provide a warrant for the decision of Jesus to speak in parables to Jews who were not disciples of Jesus in order that they would be unable to understand his message, Paul cites LXX Isa 6:9–10 in Acts 28:26–27 to depict the hardness of the audience of Paul and thus their inability to understand his message.³¹

As with Luke’s version of the parable of the sower, so the final sermon of Paul exerts a wider thematic influence upon Luke-Acts. Scholars have often noted that Luke repeats the pattern of a transfer of the message of Paul from Jews to non-Jews in Acts 13:46–47; 18:6; and 28:23–28.³² The parallels between these three accounts especially suggest that Acts 28:25–28 represents the culmination of the ministry of Paul to fellow-Jews.³³ Accordingly, the citation of LXX Isa 6:9–10

³¹ Barrett, *Acts*, 2:1245, maintains that Luke cites from LXX Isa 6:9–10 to characterize those who had “made up their minds not to understand, not to hear, not to see.” The wording of the LXX citation in Acts 28:26–27 also confirms this interpretation. The MT of Isa 6:10 indicates that the prophet was commissioned to *cause* the heart of the people to grow dull and their ears heavy, and to *cause* their eyes to be shut (see the hiphil forms הִשְׁמַן and הִשָּׁע in Isa 6:10) so that they could not understand the message of God, repent, and be healed. By contrast, LXX Isa 6:10–11 indicates that their inability to hear and understand was due to a condition of dullness and hardness that preceded their hearing of the message of God through the prophet.

³² See, e.g., Haenchen, *Acts*, 729; Jack T. Sanders, *The Jews in Luke-Acts* (London: SCM, 1987), 135; Joseph B. Tyson, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992), 140–2; Bruce, *Acts*, 541; Bock, *Acts*, 756.

³³ Scholars also frequently discuss how this conclusion to the book of Acts relates to Luke’s view of the ultimate fate of Jews. Tyson, *Images of Judaism*, 174–8, argues that the acceptance of Paul’s message in Acts 28:24 is an example of the response of individual Jews, whereas the rejection in 28:25–28 designates the corporate Jewish response to the message of Paul. He concludes that Luke celebrates the responses of individual Jews but regards the mission to Jews, on the whole, as a failure. Jack

in this final scene serves as a denunciation that applies to all three episodes.³⁴ Just as Luke presents the scriptural proclamation of Paul and Barnabas as the positive fulfillment of end-time Isaianic promises (Acts 13:46–47), so he justifies the exclusion of those who reject it by presenting their negative response as part of a scriptural pattern of obduracy.³⁵

4.3 END-TIME REVELATION AND DARKENING IN THE WRITINGS OF JUSTIN

4.3.1 “For Out of Zion Shall Go Forth the Law”

Like Luke, Justin presents the proclamation of the apostles as the realization of end-time scriptural promises and the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers as the illumination of the nations that Isa 49:6 foretells. Nevertheless, Justin also develops this theme in a manner which is dis-

T. Sanders, “The Jewish People,” in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (ed. Joseph B. Tyson; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 58–73, also argues that Jews ultimately reject the gospel and so are rejected in Luke-Acts; cf. idem, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 75–83. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:344–456, maintains that the majority of Jews reject the gospel, which leads to a tragic ending of the narrative. Others, such as Bauckham, “Restoration of Israel,” 435–87, maintain that Luke presents an open, and potentially positive, future for Jews; cf. David P. Moessner, “The Ironic Fulfillment of Israel’s Glory,” *Eight Critical Perspectives*, 35–50, who argues that Acts 28:26–28 affirms the positive fulfillment of God’s promises, even if they are fulfilled for only a remnant of Jews. See also footnote 71 below.

³⁴ Furthermore, as David P. Moessner, “Paul in Acts: Preacher of Eschatological Repentance to Israel,” *NTS* 34 (1988): 101–2, notes, in his earlier sermons the Lukan Paul also cites or alludes to scriptural passages in order to present the judgment of those who reject the message of Paul as the fulfillment of scripture (Acts 13:41 [cf. LXX Hab 1:5]; Acts 18:6 [cf. Ezek 33:4, 5]). According to Moessner, “Paul fulfils Isaiah’s calling to announce God’s inexorable judgment against a calloused folk whose ears have grown ‘thick’ and whose eyes are ‘shut’” (102). Moessner also suggests that the three announcements of judgment upon those who reject the message of Paul in Acts 13, 18, and 28 follow the pattern of judgment announced against Israel because of its rejection of the message of Jesus and his followers in the gospel of Luke. In his view, Luke-Acts continues a pattern of Israelite history that is marked by the ongoing stubbornness of its people and their rejection of its prophets. See also Luke 13:31–35.

³⁵ This reading of Luke’s description of the fulfillment of Isaianic promises differs from Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 104–8. Whereas Pao argues that Luke demonstrates a repeated Jewish rejection of the message of Paul and cites Isa 6:9–10 to show a dramatic reversal of the fate of Israel (compare Luke 3:6 [Isa 40:5] with Acts 28:27 [Isa 6:10]), I am interpreting Luke’s use of different Isaiah passages (e.g., Isa 49:6 in Acts 13:46 and Isa 6:9–10 in Acts 28:25–28) as an attempt to present both the acceptance and the rejection of the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers as complementary parts of the scripturally-ordained plan of God.

tinct from Luke in two important ways: 1) he contrasts the knowledge of Christ-believers with the adoption of the Mosaic law by proselytes to Judaism and 2) he depicts the apostles and the recipients of their message as participants in the eschatological pilgrimage described in Isaiah 2 (cf. Micah 4).³⁶

In *Dial.* 121.1–3, Justin indicates that Christ fulfilled LXX Ps 71:17 by enlightening the nations with his message of “truth and wisdom” and defeating demonic powers.³⁷ He argues that this illumination was so brilliant during the first advent of Christ that it caused some from every nation to repent from their former wicked way of life,³⁸ and even to suffer torment rather than deny their faith in Christ. Subsequently, Justin describes this enlightenment as the present realization of Isa 49:6:

Ἡμῖν οὖν ἐδόθη καὶ ἀκοῦσαι καὶ συνεῖναι καὶ σωθῆναι διὰ τούτου τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπιγνῶναι πάντα. Διὰ τοῦτο ἔλεγε πρὸς αὐτόν· Μέγα σοί ἐστι τοῦ κληθῆναι σε παῖδά μου, τοῦ στήσαι τὰς φυλάς τοῦ Ἰακώβ καὶ τὰς διασποράς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπιστρέψαι· τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἔθνων,³⁹ τοῦ εἶναι σε εἰς σωτηρίαν αὐτῶν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς.⁴⁰

³⁶ Although Luke nowhere cites or alludes to Isa 2:2–4, Oskar Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 360, maintains that this theme is “deeply embedded in the overall structure of Acts”; cf. Eric Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1975), 122–4; Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory & Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity with Tradition & Transmission in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 214–25; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 158–9.

³⁷ In *Dial.* 121.1, Justin asserts that the words of LXX Ps 71:17—“His name shall endure forever; it shall rise above the sun; and all nations shall be blessed in him”—refer only to Christ because the text does not say “in his seed” (see parallel references to Abraham in Gen 12:2; 22:18) but “in him.” For Justin, this indicates that the Abrahamic and Davidic blessings promised for the nations come through only one individual, namely, Christ (see also *Dialogue* 120). Note that, in *Dial.* 121.1, Justin uses an unusual version of LXX Ps 71:17b which reads ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. Compare LXX Ps 71:17b which reads εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη μακαριοῦσιν αὐτόν. Compare also *Dial.* 121.1 with *Dial.* 34:6 and 64:6, where Justin follows the wording of LXX Ps 71:17b. For further discussion of the different version of LXX Ps 71:17 in *Dial.* 121.1 and the sources that Justin may have used, see Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 84–5.

³⁸ Justin draws a similar conclusion from his reading of LXX Ps 109:1–4 in *Dial.* 83.1–4: “But, although our Jesus has not yet returned in glory, he has sent forth into Jerusalem the sceptre of power, namely, the call to repentance to all the nations over which the demons used to rule” (*Dial.* 109.4; cf. *1 Apol.* 45.2–4).

³⁹ Note the omission of the phrase εἰς διαθήκην γένους from LXX Isa 49:6.

⁴⁰ William S. Kurz, “The Function of Christological Proof from Prophecy for Luke and Justin” (PhD diss., Yale University, 1976), 241, suggests that Justin’s addition of

To us, therefore, it has been given to hear and understand and to be saved by this Christ, and to know all the things of the Father.⁴¹ Because of this, he said to him: "It is a great thing for you to be called my servant, to establish the tribes of Jacob and to bring back the dispersed ones of Israel. I have appointed you as a light of the nations, so that you may be for their salvation to the end of the earth" (LXX Isa 49:6). (*Dial.* 121.4)

Since elsewhere in the *Dialogue*, the grace that Christ-believers receive to hear, understand, and know revealed truth relates to their reception of the correct interpretation of the scriptures, this description of the privileged knowledge of Christ-believers probably refers to the endowment of a special capacity to understand Christ and his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures.⁴² It would appear that Justin regards the revelatory exegesis of Christ-believers as the fulfillment of Isa 49:6.

The section immediately following *Dial.* 121.1–4 also strongly suggests that, for Justin, the exegesis of Christ-believers represents the realization of Isaianic promises. In *Dialogue* 122, Justin outlines a lengthy contrast between the revelatory knowledge of the Jewish scriptures that Christ-believers possess and the adoption of the Mosaic law by proselytes to Judaism. In this passage, he argues that Trypho and his companions wrongly believe that Isa 49:6 refers to the latter group: "You suppose that this (i.e., Isa 49:6) was spoken with reference to the stranger and the proselyte, but in reality it was spoken with reference to us Christians who have been enlightened by Jesus" (*Dial.* 122.1). He then cites and expounds Isaiah 42:6–7 as further scriptural proof for his own conclusion:

Καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἄλλοις βοᾷ· Ἐγὼ κύριος <ὁ θεὸς> ἐκάλεσά σε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ κρατήσω τῆς χειρός σου καὶ ἰσχύσω σε, καὶ θήσω σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους, εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν, ἀνοίξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλῶν, ἐξαγαγεῖν

αὐτῶν to LXX Isa 49:6 emphasizes that non-Jews have become the recipients of the light that Christ mediates. Compare the phrase from LXX Isa 49:6: εἰς σωτηρίαν ἔως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

⁴¹ Here I have attempted to provide a very literal translation that clearly represents Justin's emphasis on the possession of knowledge by Christ-believers. Compare the translation of Thomas P. Halton, *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho* (ed. Michael Slusser; Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2003), 182: "We therefore, were endowed with the special grace of hearing and understanding, of being saved by Christ, and of knowing all truths revealed by the Father."

⁴² Compare, for example, the verbal and conceptual parallels in passages that refer explicitly to Christ-believers' possession of the correct understanding of the Jewish scriptures (*Dial.* 7.1–3; 30.1; 58.1; 78.10–11; 92.1; 100.2; 119.1).

ἐκ δεσμῶν πεπεδημένους. Ἐπεὶ καὶ ταῦτα, ὦ ἄνδρες, πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν πεφωτισμένων εἴρηται. Ἡ πάλιν ὑμεῖς ἐρεῖτε· Πρὸς τὸν νόμον λέγει καὶ τοὺς προσηλύτους ταῦτα; Καὶ ὥσπερ ἐν θεάτρῳ ἀνέκραγόν τινες τῶν τῇ δευτέρᾳ ἀφιγμένων· Ἀλλὰ τί; Οὐ πρὸς τὸν νόμον λέγει καὶ τοὺς φωτιζομένους ὑπ' αὐτοῦ; Οἶδοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ προσήλυτοι. Οὐκ, ἔφην, ἀπιδὼν πρὸς τὸν Τρύφωνα. Ἐπεὶ εἰ νόμος εἶχε τὸ φωτίζειν τὰ ἔθνη καὶ τοὺς ἔχοντας αὐτόν, τίς χρεῖα καινῆς διαθήκης; Ἐπεὶ δὲ καινὴν διαθήκην καὶ νόμον αἰώνιον καὶ πρόσταγμα ὁ θεὸς προεκήρυσσε πέμψειν, οὐχὶ τὸν παλαιὸν νόμον ἀκουσόμεθα καὶ τοὺς προσηλύτους αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ τοὺς προσηλύτους αὐτοῦ, <τούτέστιν> ἡμᾶς τὰ ἔθνη, οὓς ἐφώτισεν.

And again in other places he cries out: “I the Lord <God> have called you in justice, and I will take your hand, and strengthen you, and I will appoint you as a covenant of a race, as a light of nations, to open the eyes of the blind, and to bring out those who have been bound from prison” (Isa 42:6–7). For these things, also, O men, have been spoken with reference to Christ and concern the nations that have been enlightened. Or will you say again, “He speaks these things with reference to the Law and the proselytes”? Then some of those who had come on the second day began to shout as though they were in a theatre: “But why? Does he not speak with reference to the Law and those enlightened by it? Now these are the proselytes.” “No,” I said, looking straight at Trypho, “For if the Law had (the ability) to enlighten the nations and those who possess it, why is there need for a new covenant? But, since God proclaimed beforehand that he would send a new covenant, and an eternal law and commandment, we shall not hear (in the above-quoted passage a reference to) the old law and its proselytes, but (a reference to) Christ and his proselytes, <that is>, us, the nations whom he has enlightened.” (*Dial.* 122.3–5)

By referring to Christ as the new covenant and to Christ-believers as “proselytes,” Justin provides an interpretation of Isa 49:6 (cf. 42:6–7) that directly counters the view that this passage refers to a non-eschatological illumination provided by the Mosaic law.⁴³ Justin reasons that if the Mosaic law had the power to enlighten people, scripture would not speak of a future new covenant.⁴⁴ Since it does speak of such a covenant,

⁴³ Luke refers to a “new covenant” (Luke 22:20) only once and does not develop this concept in his writings. Justin may have developed the idea of Christ as the new covenant from Paul (e.g., Rom 11:27; 1 Cor 11:25; 2 Cor 3:6, 14–15), the author of Hebrews (e.g., Heb 7:22; 8:6, 8–10; 10:16; 12:24; 13:20), or *Barn.* 14:6–7, but he also shapes this concept in his own way and develops it in relation to his interpretation of Isa 42:6–7 and 49:6 in a manner that these other writers do not.

⁴⁴ This interpretation implicitly depends on the assumption that “covenant” in Isa 42:6–7 refers to the new covenant promised in LXX Jer 38:31 (cf. *Dial.* 11.3) rather

however, he asserts that Isa 42:6 must also predict this new covenant, and therefore refer to Christ. By reading into Isa 42:6–7 the concept of a new covenant (LXX Jer 38:31), Justin affirms his eschatological, messianic interpretation of both Isa 49:6 and 42:6–7 over against the historical, non-messianic reading of Trypho and his associates.⁴⁵ In so doing, he presents the acceptance of Christ and his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures as the only means of practicing proper covenant fidelity.

According to Justin, the message and scriptural interpretation that the apostles proclaim also initiates a preliminary realization of the blessings promised in Isaiah 2 (cf. Micah 4). For example, in *1 Apol.* 39.1–3, Justin likens the message of the apostles to the Law that would go forth from Zion in the eschatological age, and explains that both their preaching and its effects fulfill the promises of Isa 2:3–4:

than the one made on Sinai. Justin does not refer to LXX Jer 38:31 in this context, but in *Dial.* 11.3 he joins Isa 55:4–5 with LXX Jer 38:31 to present Christ as the new law, and as the referent of “covenant” in both of these passages. See also *Dial.* 24.1.

⁴⁵ Compare also Rom 2:17–20. The interpretation of Isa 42:6–7 and 49:6 that Justin attributes to Trypho—whether real or constructed—provides the framework for his own reading of these passages. As Oskar Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 353–4, has noted, some Jewish sources describe the conversion of a proselyte to Judaism in terms reminiscent of the illumination of the nations described in Isa 42:6–7 and 49:6. For example, *Joseph and Aseneth* refers to the conversion of proselytes as a movement from “darkness to light, from error to truth” and associates obedience to the Law with illumination (8:10; 15:12). Similarly, Philo indicates that the Mosaic law has the capacity to give non-Jews “sight” and enlightenment in exchange for their darkness: “they have now received their sight, beholding the most brilliant of all lights instead of the most profound darkness” (*Virt.* 175; cf. *Mos.* 2:27.44). A Jewish-Christian text, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (TP), which underwent a series of Christian redactions in the second century CE, similarly depicts the law as a type of illumination. *T. Lev.* 19.1–2 refers to illumination as knowledge that comes from the “law of the Lord”: “And now, my children, you have heard all; choose, therefore, for yourselves either the light or the darkness, either the law of the Lord or the works of Beliar” (cf. *T. Lev.* 18.9). *T. Lev.* 14.3–4 indicates that the law was entrusted to Israel for the purpose of illuminating all peoples. Although the Christian redaction of this text prevents us from isolating its Jewish traditions in a definitive way, the language and concepts that *T. Lev.* 14.3–4 uses to describe the illumination provided by the law resembles the interpretation of Isa 49:6 and 42:6–7 that Justin attributes to Trypho (note, especially, the common use of φωτίζω and cognate terms). Marc Hirshman, “Rabbinic Universalism in the Second and Third Centuries,” *HTR* 93 (2000): 101–15, also points out that a number of tannaitic sources portray Israelites as mediators of Torah and assert that the Torah was available to all humankind (e.g., *Sifre Lev* 18:1–5; *Sifre Num* 18:20; m. Avot 1.12; 3.12–13; *Mekilta de R. Ishmael*, Tractate of Amalek, Exod 17:8–16). Hirshman argues that these three sources probably represent the same school of thought during approximately the same time period (second-third century CE), and present a form of universalism that is not messianic and eschatological, but historical; all humankind has access to God’s commandments and through them salvation. He notes, however, that Isaiah 40–66 was not a prominent scriptural source for these early rabbis.

“Ὅταν δὲ ὡς προφητεῦον τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι λαλήῃ τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα, οὕτως λέγει· “Ἐκ γὰρ Σιών ἐξελεύσεται νόμος, καὶ λόγος Κυρίου ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ· καὶ κρινεῖ ἀνὰ μέσον ἐθνῶν καὶ ἐλέγξει λαὸν πολύν, καὶ συγκόψουσι τὰς μαχαίρας αὐτῶν εἰς ἄροτρα καὶ τὰς ζιβύνας αὐτῶν εἰς δρέπανα. καὶ οὐ μὴ λήψονται ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος μάχαιραν καὶ οὐ μὴ μάθωσιν ἔτι πολεμεῖν.” καὶ ὅτι οὕτως γέγονε πεισθῆναι δύνασθε. ἀπὸ γὰρ Ἱερουσαλήμ ἄνδρες δεκαδύο τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ οὗτοι ἰδιώται λαλεῖν μὴ δυνάμενοι. διὰ δὲ θεοῦ δυνάμεως ἐμήνυσαν παντὶ γένει ἀνθρώπων ὡς ἀπεστάλησαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδάξαι πάντας τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον. καὶ οἱ πάλαι ἀλληλοφόντοι οὐ μόνον οὐ πολεμοῦμεν τοὺς ἐχθρούς, ἀλλ’ ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηδὲ ψεύδεσθαι μηδ’ ἐξαπατῆσαι τοὺς ἐξετάζοντας, ἡδέως ὁμολογοῦντες τὸν Χριστὸν ἀποθνήσκομεν.

But when the prophetic Spirit speaks, as foretelling the things that are going to happen, he speaks in this way: “For the Law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge between the nations, and rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into ploughs, and their spears into sickles; and nation shall not take up sword against nation, neither shall they learn to war anymore” (Isa 2:3–4). And that it has happened so, you are able to be persuaded, for twelve men in number, although they were unlearned and not able to speak, went out from Jerusalem into the world. By the power of God they made known to every race of humans how they were sent by Christ to teach all the word of God; and we, who formerly killed one another, not only do not fight against enemies, but die gladly confessing Christ, in order neither to lie nor to deceive those who examine us.

(1 *Apol.* 39.1–3)

Similarly, in *Dial.* 109.1–110.2, Justin evokes the image of an eschatological pilgrimage to describe the mission of the apostles and cites parallel material from Mic 4:1–7. In this latter context, Justin also attempts to refute an argument that he attributes to the teachers of Trypho. Justin explains that these teachers mistakenly conclude that Mic 4:1–7 has not yet been fulfilled because they do not recognize the two advents of Christ, one in which he suffered without glory and another in which he will come from heaven in glory:

Ἀλλ’ ὅτι τὰ ἔθνη <ἔμελλον> μετανοεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας, ἐν ᾗ πλανώμενοι ἐπολιτεύοντο, ἀκούσαντα τὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ κηρυχθέντα <τοῦ> δι’ αὐτοὺς μαθόντα⁴⁶ λόγον, κἄν λόγους βραχεῖς λέγοντός μου ἀπὸ προφητείας Μιχαίου, ἐνὸς τῶν δώδεκα, ἀνάσχεσθε.

⁴⁶ Miroslav Marcovich, ed. *Iustini Martyris: Apologiae pro Christianis, Dialogus cum Tryphone* (PTS 38; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 256, provides παθόντος but lists μαθόντα as an alternative (cf. Maran, Otto). With Halton, *St. Justin*, 163, I have adopted μαθόντα as the correct reading.

Εἰσι δὲ οὗτοι....Καὶ τελέσας ταῦτα ἐπεῖπον· Καὶ ὅτι οἱ διδάσκαλοι ὑμῶν, ὧ ἄνδρες, τοὺς πάντας λόγους τῆς περικοπῆς ταύτης εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰρῆσθαι, ἐπίσταμαι· καὶ αὐτὸν ὅτι οὐδέπω φασὶν ἐληλυθέναι, καὶ τοῦτο γινώσκω· εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐληλυθέναι λέγουσιν, οὐ γινώσκεται ὅς ἐστιν, ἀλλ’ ὅταν ἐμφανῆς καὶ ἔνδοξος γένηται, τότε γνωσθήσεται ὅς ἐστι φασί. Καὶ τότε τὰ εἰρημένα ἐν τῇ περικοπῇ ταύτῃ φασὶν ἀποβήσεσθαι, ὡς μηδενὸς μηδέπω καρποῦ ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τῆς προφητείας γενομένου. Ἀλόγιστοι, μὴ συνιέντες ὅπερ διὰ πάντων τῶν λόγων ἀποδέδεικται, ὅτι δύο παρουσίαι αὐτοῦ κατηγγελμένοι εἰσὶ· μία μὲν, ἐν ᾗ παθητὸς καὶ ἄδοξος καὶ ἄτιμος καὶ σταυρούμενος κεκήρυκται, ἡ δὲ δευτέρα, ἐν ᾗ μετὰ δόξης ἀπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν παρέσται·

But (to show) that the nations <were going> to repent from the evil, in which they conducted their lives when they were deceived, after they heard the message that was proclaimed from Jerusalem by his apostles, which they learned through them, allow me to cite brief words from the prophecy of Micah, one of the twelve (prophets). They are these.... When I had concluded these things (from Mic 4:1–7), I added, “O men, I understand that your teachers admit that all the words of this passage refer to Christ; I also know this—that they say that he has not yet come. But they say that even if he has come, it is not known who he is, but they say that, when he becomes manifest and glorious, then it shall be known who he is. And then, they state, the things spoken in this passage will happen, as if there was not yet any fruit from the words of the prophecy. O unreasoning people who do not understand what has been shown by all these passages, namely, that his two advents have been announced: the first, in which he has been proclaimed as suffering, inglorious, dishonored, and crucified; and the second, in which he will come from the heavens with glory.

(*Dial.* 109.1–110.2)

Justin thus presents the message of the apostles as an initial fulfillment of scriptural promises that foretell an eschatological pilgrimage of the nations but explains that a future fulfillment of Mic 4:1–7 will also occur.⁴⁷

Although Justin does not identify the preaching of the apostles as scriptural interpretation in these contexts, his explicit description of this element of their kerygma elsewhere (e.g., *1 Apol.* 49.5; 50.12; *Dial.* 53.5–6; 76.6–7) makes it possible to infer that the phrases “they were sent by Christ to teach everyone the word of God” in *1 Apol.* 39.3 and “the word preached by the apostles from Jerusalem” in *Dial.* 109.1 include the declaration of how Christ fulfilled the scriptures. In

⁴⁷ See also *1 Apol.* 45.1–6.

Justin's interpretation of Isaiah 2 (cf. Micah 4), then, the preaching and scriptural interpretation of the apostles represents the "Law" and "Word" that goes out from Zion and Jerusalem in the last days.

Justin also indicates that the current behavior of Christ-believers furnishes proof that the prophecies of Isaiah 2 (cf. Micah 4) have been fulfilled as a result of the first advent of Christ:

οἵτινες, ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ ἐξεληθέντος ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ διὰ τῶν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀποστόλων τὴν θεοσεβειαν ἐπιγνόντες, ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν Ἰακώβ καὶ θεὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατεφύγομεν. Καὶ οἱ πολέμου καὶ ἀλληλοφονίας καὶ πάσης κακίας μεμεστωμένοι ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς γῆς τὰ πολεμικὰ ὄργανα ἕκαστος, τὰς μαχαίρας εἰς ἄροτρα καὶ τὰς ζιβύνas εἰς γεωργικὰ <ὄργανα>, μετεβάλομεν, καὶ γεωργοῦμεν εὐσεβειαν, δικαιοσύνην, φιланθρωπίαν, πίστιν, ἐλπίδα τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος <δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἔχοντες>· ὑπὸ τὴν ἄμπελον τὴν ἐαυτοῦ ἕκαστος καθεζόμενοι, τουτέστι μόνῃ τῇ γαμετῇ γυναικὶ ἕκαστος χρώμενοι·

We (Christians), who have come to an understanding of the worship of God from the law and the word that went forth from Jerusalem through the apostles of Jesus, have run for protection to the God of Jacob and the God of Israel. And we who had been filled with war, with the slaughter of one another, and with every evil have each, from every part of the world, converted our war implements—our swords into ploughshares, our spears into farmers' <tools>—and we cultivate piety, justice, brotherly love, faith, and hope, which <has been given to us and we have> from the Father himself through the crucified one; each sitting under his own vine, that is, each one possessing only his married wife.

(*Dial.* 110.2–3)

In response to the end-time proclamation of the apostles, Christ-believers repent of their former sinful practices (*Dial.* 109.1) and turn from violence to a peaceful, pious, and righteous way of life (*Dial.* 109.3; cf. *1 Apol.* 39.1, 3).⁴⁸ Accordingly, Justin represents this repentance and change in lifestyle as proof of their involvement in the initial realization of an eschatological pilgrimage: as a result of their reception of the "Law" and "Word," Christ-believers "come to an understanding of the worship of God" (*Dial.* 110.2), turn their "swords into ploughshares" and "spears into farmers' tools" (*Dial.* 110.3; cf. *1 Apol.* 39.3), and sit

⁴⁸ Moreover, Christ-believers continue these new practices even when under the threat of persecution and death (*1 Apol.* 39.3–4; *Dial.* 110.4). Denis Minns and Paul Parvis, *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies* (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 183, suggest that *1 Apol.* 39.3 may refer to the experience of Christians who are "under scrutiny as part of the process of military review." If so, Justin would indicate in this context that Christians refuse to take the military oath and to serve as soldiers.

peacefully under their “own vine” (*Dial.* 110.3).⁴⁹ Justin thus seeks to show the legitimacy of their message and scriptural interpretation by presenting the apostles and the recipients of their message as participants in the end-time pilgrimage that Isaiah 2 (Micah 4) predicts.⁵⁰

4.3.2 “*The Lawgiver Has Come but You Do Not See Him*”

Just as he portrays the exegesis and proclamation of Christ-believers as the fulfillment of end-time scriptural promises, so Justin provides scriptural warrant for his negative characterization of those who misunderstand, or reject, their scriptural interpretation and message. In numerous contexts, he appeals to prophetic oracles of judgment to justify his conclusion that this misunderstanding was also part of God’s plan.⁵¹ In the majority of these passages, moreover, Justin contrasts the positive responses of insiders to the Christ-believing community with the negative responses of outsiders.

Within the *Apologies*, *1 Apol.* 49.1–5 serves as an important example of how Justin uses scriptural prophecy to describe this type of a division between insiders and outsiders:

Καὶ πάλιν πῶς δι’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἡσαΐου λέλεκται ὅτι οἱ οὐ προσδοκήσαντες αὐτὸν λαοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτόν, οἱ δὲ αἰεὶ προσδοκῶντες Ἰουδαῖοι ἀγνοήσουσι παραγενόμενον αὐτόν. ἐλέχθησαν δὲ οἱ λόγοι ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. εἰσὶ δὲ οὗτοι· “Ἐμφανὴς ἐγενήθη τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν· εὗρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσι. εἶπον, Ἰδοὺ εἰμι ἔθνη οἱ οὐκ ἐκάλεσαν τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐξέπετασα τὰς χεῖράς μου ἐπὶ λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα, καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα ἐπὶ τοῦς πορευομένους ἐν ὁδῷ οὐ καλῇ,

⁴⁹ Justin makes this explicit in *Dial.* 110.1–2 where he explains that part of Mic 4:1–7 has been fulfilled as a result of the first advent of Christ, and the consequent worship and practices of the Christ-believing community, but indicates that other parts of this prophecy will be realized at his second advent. See also *Dial.* 121.3.

⁵⁰ In *Dial.* 24.1–3, Justin also describes the fulfillment of Isa 2:3 (cf. Isa 55:3; LXX Jer 38:31) and attempts to demonstrate how the experiences of those who receive this message represent their participation in the eschatological pilgrimage.

⁵¹ *1 Apol.* 36.3–37.1 (Isa 1:3–4); 49.1–3 (Isa 65:1–3); *Dial.* 12.1–2 (Isa 55:3–5; Isa 6:10 [see also the allusion to Isa 6:10 in *Dial.* 33.1 and possibly 69.4]); 24.3–4 (Isa 65:1–3); 27.4 (Isa 29:13); 32.5 (Isa 29:14); 34.1–6 (LXX Ps 18:7; 71:1–20); 78.10–11 (Isa 29:13–14); 114.5 (Jer 2:13); 118.3–4 (Isa 52:15; 53:1); 119.1–2 (Deut 32:16–23); 123.2–4 (Isa 29:14); 140.1–2 (Jer 2:13; Isa 29:13). In these passages, Justin describes the inability of Jews to recognize and understand prophetic references to Christ (e.g., *1 Apol.* 36.3–37.1; 49.1–3; *Dial.* 32.5; 78.10–11; 114.5; 118.3–4) and the true intent and nature of the law (*Dial.* 12.1–2; 24.3–4; 27.4; 34.1–6; 123.2–4).

ἀλλ' ὀπίσω τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν. ὁ λαὸς ὁ παροξύνων⁵² ἐναντίον μου.” Ἰουδαῖοι γάρ, ἔχοντες τὰς προφητείας καὶ αἰὲν προσδοκῆσαντες τὸν Χριστὸν παραγεννῶμενον, παραγενόμενον ἠγνόησαν· οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρεχρήσαντο. οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν, μηδέποτε μηδὲν ἀκούσαντες περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μέχρις οὗ οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐξεληθόντες ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ ἐμήνυσαν τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς προφητείας παρέδωκαν, πληρωθέντες χαρᾶς καὶ πίστεως τοῖς εἰδώλοις ἀπετάξαντο καὶ τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἑαυτοὺς ἀνέθηκαν.

And again (consider) how it has been said through the same⁵³ Isaiah that the peoples of the nations who did not expect him would worship him, but that the Jews who always expect him would not recognize him when he arrived. The words were spoken as from the character of Christ himself. They are these: “I became manifest to those who did not ask for me; I was found by those who did not seek me. I said, ‘Behold I am (here)’ to a nation that did not call my name. I stretched out my hands to a disobedient and contradicting people, to those who go in a way that is not good, but after their own sins. The people that provokes is before me” (Isa 65:1–3).⁵⁴ For the Jews, who had the prophecies and were always expecting the Christ to arrive, did not recognize (him) when he arrived, and not only that, but they even mistreated (him). But those from the nations who never heard anything about Christ until when his apostles went out from Jerusalem and made known the things concerning him and handed over the prophecies, were filled with joy and faith, turned away from the idols, and dedicated themselves to the unbegotten God through Christ.

(1 *Apol.* 49.1–5)

Justin maintains that Jews should have recognized Christ since they always had the prophecies that predicted his coming. He argues, however, that non-Jews instead of Jews became the recipients of the prophecies: the apostles bequeathed (παρέδωκαν)⁵⁵ the prophecies and, by implication, their correct interpretation to the nations who, in turn, responded appropriately to this exegesis (1 *Apol.* 49.5). For Justin, Isa 65:1–3 justifies this tragic outcome since it predicts the correct understanding of non-Jewish Christ-believers (“I became manifest to those who did not ask for me; I was found by those who did not seek me...to a

⁵² Marcovich, *Iustini*, 100, adds με from the LXX, but Minns and Parvis, *Justin*, 204, leave it omitted.

⁵³ As Minns and Parvis, *Justin*, 205, note, Justin uses both αὐτοῦ τοῦ and τοῦ αὐτοῦ to mean “the same” (cf. 1 *Apol.* 40.5; 41.5; *Dial.* 43.4).

⁵⁴ For the differences between Isa 65:1–3 as cited here by Justin and the LXX text, see Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 65–7.

⁵⁵ As Minns and Parvis, 205, note, the use of παρέδωκαν suggests “a formal bequeathing of the prophecies to the nations.”

nation that did not call my name”; Isa 65:1) and foretells the obduracy of Jews (“I stretched out my hands to a disobedient and contradicting people, to those who go in a way that is not good, but after their own sins”; Isa 65:2–3).⁵⁶ Through his appropriation of Isa 65:1–3, Justin provides scriptural justification for the reversal of the status of these two groups.

Similarly, in the *Dialogue*, Justin frequently appeals to the Jewish scriptures to justify his distinction between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community. For example, in *Dialogue* 11, Justin cites and interprets Isa 51:4–5 and Jer 31:31–32 to depict Christ as the new law and covenant, and to describe Christ-believers as those who have correctly understood and become adherents of this new law. Subsequently, in *Dial.* 12.1–2, he cites Isa 55:3–5 together with Isa 6:10 to portray both the reception and rejection of Christ’s fulfillment of the scriptures as the fulfillment of prophecy:

Ἐλεγον δὲ ἔτι καὶ προσέφερον ὅτι καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις λόγοις Ἡσαΐας βοᾷ· Ἀκούσατέ μου τοὺς λόγους, καὶ ζήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν· καὶ διαθήσομαι ὑμῖν διαθήκην αἰώνιον, τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά. Ἴδου μάρτυρα αὐτὸν ἔθνεσι δέδωκα.... Ἐθνη, ἃ οὐκ οἶδασί σε, ἐπικαλέσονται σε, λαοί, οἳ οὐκ ἐπίστανταί σε, καταφεύξονται ἐπὶ σὲ ἕνεκεν τοῦ θεοῦ σου τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰσραήλ, ὅτι ἐδόξασέ σε.⁵⁷ Τοῦτον αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς ἠτιμώσατε τὸν νόμον καὶ τὴν καινὴν ἀγίαν αὐτοῦ διαθήκην ἐφανλίσατε, καὶ οὐδὲ νῦν παραδέχεσθε οὐδὲ μετανοεῖτε πράξαντες κακῶς. Ἔτι γὰρ τὰ ὅτα ὑμῶν πέφρακται, οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν πεπῆρωνται καὶ πεπᾶνται ἡ καρδιά. Κέκραγεν Ἱερεμίας, καὶ οὐδ’ οὕτως ἀκούετε· πάρεστιν ὁ νομοθέτης, καὶ οὐκ ὁράτε· πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται, τυφλοὶ βλέπουσι, καὶ οὐ συνίετε.

Now I said and still added that Isaiah also cries out in other words: “Hear my words, and your soul shall live, and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, the sure mercies of David. Behold, I have given him for a witness to the nations.... Nations that do not know you shall call upon you, and peoples that do not understand you shall run to you, for the sake of your God, the Holy One of Israel; for he has glorified you” (Isa 55:3–5). You have despised this very law (i.e., Christ), and have slighted his new holy covenant, and now you neither receive it, nor do you repent when you do evil. For Jeremiah has exclaimed: “For your ears have still been closed, your eyes have been blinded, and your heart

⁵⁶ See the similar use of Isa 65:1–2 in Rom 10:20–21.

⁵⁷ Regarding the variations between this citation of Isa 55:3–5 and the LXX, see Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 63–4, 187, 449.

has become dull" (Isa 6:10);⁵⁸ and thus you do not hear. The lawgiver is present but you do not see; "the poor have the gospel preached to them, the blind see" (Matt 11:5; Luke 7:22), yet you do not understand. (*Dial.* 12.1–2)

According to Justin, Isa 55:3–5 predicts the positive reception of Christ by non-Jews whereas Isa 6:10 describes Jews who have not recognized or accepted Christ as the new covenant and law.⁵⁹ In other words, those who embrace his explanation of how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures become recipients of Isaianic promises of salvation whereas those who reject this fulfillment embody the blindness that Isaiah predicted.

4.4 DIFFERING CONFIGURATIONS OF INSIDERS AND OUTSIDERS

Although Luke and Justin similarly construe the acceptance and rejection of the exegesis of Jesus and his followers as the fulfillment of end-time scriptural promises, they do not distinguish between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community in precisely the same way. A comparison of Luke 8:10 and *Dial.* 121.4–122.1 illustrates both the similarity and difference between Luke and Justin:

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Ὑμῖν δέδοται γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς, ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν.

And he said, "To you it has been given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but to the others in parables, in order that 'seeing they may not perceive, and hearing they may not understand' (Isa 6:9–10)." (Luke 8:10)

Ἡμῖν οὖν ἐδόθη καὶ ἀκοῦσαι καὶ συνεῖναι καὶ σωθῆναι διὰ τούτου τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπιγινῶναι πάντα. Διὰ τοῦτο ἔλεγε πρὸς αὐτόν· Μέγα σοί ἐστι τοῦ κληθῆναι σε παῖδά μου, τοῦ στήσαι τὰς φυλάς τοῦ Ἰακώβ καὶ τὰς διασποράς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπιστρέψαι· τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν, τοῦ εἶναι σε εἰς σωτηρίαν αὐτῶν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς. Ταῦτα

⁵⁸ Justin incorrectly attributes this passage to Jeremiah. Note also that the wording of LXX Isa 6:10 differs substantially from the text of Justin.

⁵⁹ Moreover, he appeals to a saying from the double tradition to accentuate his description of the blindness and misunderstanding of Jews. Whereas Matthew and Luke use this tradition to answer the question posed by the disciples of John the Baptist about the identity of Christ, Justin applies this saying to the misunderstanding of his ostensibly Jewish audience.

ὕμεις μὲν εἰς τὸν γῆόραν⁶⁰ καὶ τοὺς προφηλῦτους εἰρησθαι νομίζετε, τῷ ὄντι δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς εἴρηται, τοὺς διὰ Ἰησοῦ πεφωτισμένους.

To us, therefore, it has been given to hear and understand and to be saved by this Christ, and to know all the things of the Father. Because of this, he said to him: "It is a great thing for you to be called my servant, to establish the tribes of Jacob and to bring back the dispersed ones of Israel. I have appointed you as a light of the nations, so that you may be for their salvation to the end of the earth" (LXX Isa 49:6). You suppose that these things were spoken with reference to the stranger and the proselytes, but in reality it was spoken with reference to us who have been enlightened by Jesus.

(*Dial.* 121.4–122.1)

Their use of common themes to describe the difference between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community suggests that Luke and Justin may have drawn upon a common source, or that Justin relied upon a synoptic tradition. Especially notable is their use of similar terminology to depict the transfer of knowledge and insight from one group to another; compare terms and phrases in Luke 8:10 (ὕμιν δέδοται γνῶναι, ἀκούοντες, συνιῶσιν) with those in *Dial.* 121.4 (ἡμῖν οὖν ἐδόθη, ἀκοῦσαι, συνεῖναι, ἐπιγνῶναι).⁶¹ Despite these parallels, the divergent contexts of each passage demonstrate an important difference between them.

In Luke 8:10–15 and 8:19–21, Luke outlines the difference between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community by emphasizing the importance of hearing, understanding, and obeying "the word of God." In Luke 8:11–15, he portrays three types of recipients of the message of God in whom the word does not take root, as Matthew and Mark also do. Unlike the other synoptic gospel writers, however, Luke characterizes the fourth group as those who hear the "word of God" with honest and good hearts, hold it fast, and bear fruit with endurance.⁶² Luke thus associates proper understanding of

⁶⁰ γῆόρας appears to originate from either γειώρας (sojourner, stranger) from LXX Ex 12:19 or γιώρας from LXX Isa 14:1. These terms themselves appear to derive from the Aramaic term ܓܝܪܐ. Marcovich, *Iustini*, 280, also appears to associate γῆόρας with the Hebrew term גֵּר.

⁶¹ To my knowledge, no one has noted these parallels. Clearly, Justin was familiar with the parable of the sower (see *Dialogue* 125), but it is not entirely certain that he here relies on a synoptic gospel tradition.

⁶² Compare Matt 13:19, 23, which presents understanding the word as essential to bearing fruit. Similarly, Mark 4:20 indicates that those who hear and accept the word will bear fruit. Walter Grundmann, "ἀγαθός," and "καλός," in *Theological Dictionary*

the message of God with moral integrity, endurance, and obedience. In Luke 8:19–21, he reinforces this defining characteristic of Christ-believers by having Jesus declare that those who hear and obey the “word of God” are his true family: “And he answered them saying: ‘My mother and my brothers are those who hear and do the word of God’” (Luke 8:21). In other words, Luke has Jesus replace a traditional means of self-definition—family ties—with a different group boundary marker—hearing and obeying the message of God.⁶³ The repetition of the phrase “the word of God” in Luke 8:10 and 8:21 underscores the connection between these two passages.⁶⁴ Together, they depict correct understanding of and obedience to “the word of God” as central boundary markers that distinguish Christ-believers from other Jews.⁶⁵

Although Justin presents correct understanding and righteous behavior as identifying marks of Christ-believers (*1 Apol.* 39.1–4; *Dial.* 109.1–110.3; 121.2–3), he also develops a sharp contrast between non-Jews who believe in Jesus and Jews and their proselytes in *Dial.* 122.1–123.4. As the new law and covenant, Christ illumines the nations, Justin argues, whereas Jews wrongly assume that they can enlighten proselytes by instructing them in the Mosaic law (*Dialogue* 122.1–123.4). According to Justin,

of New Testament Words (10 vols.; trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; eds. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1975), 1:11–12; 3:538–544, notes that, in Hellenistic sources, the phrase “honest and good” (καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ) conveys the idea of moral integrity. A similar phrase is also used to describe a righteous individual in Tob. 5:14 (τῆς καλῆς καὶ ἀγαθῆς). So also 2 Macc. 15:12 (καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθόν); 4 Macc. 4:1 (καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθόν); cf. Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (2 vols.; BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994–1996), 1:738; Marshall, *Luke*, 327; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:714; Nolland, *Luke*, 1:387; Dupont, “La parabole,” 107.

⁶³ The apparent disregard of Jesus for his immediate family members in Luke 8:21 corresponds closely to the portrayal of a conflict between Jesus and his kinship group in Luke 4:16–30. In Luke 4, Jesus interprets the Jewish scriptures in such a way that his hometown audience does not represent the primary beneficiaries of his fulfillment of them. Similarly, in Luke 8:21, Jesus rejects the demands of his immediate family members and presents those who hear and obey the “word of God” as his true relatives.

⁶⁴ Robinson, “Preaching the Word,” 133.

⁶⁵ Kodell, “The Word of God,” 517, states that hearing and accepting “the word” leads to inclusion within the community of God’s people; cf. Dupont, “La parabole,” 97–8, 108, who argues that this element is Lukan. Similarly, Birger Gerhardsson, “The Parable of the Sower,” *NTS* 14 (1968): 183, suggests that Luke is “depicting how the new fellowship is formed round Jesus, a ‘family’ of those who are bound together spiritually rather than by ties of blood: they hear the word of God and do it (cf. 18:28–30): this is ‘the Israel after the spirit.’” Significantly, perhaps, the parallel passages in the other synoptic gospel accounts do not make the same connection to “the word” (Matt 12:50; Mark 3:35); they portray the family of Jesus as those who do the will of God without reference to hearing and understanding the message of Jesus or the “word of God.”

Jews cannot possibly fulfill the role of illuminating others because they remain darkened and ignorant themselves; their inability to recognize Christ as the new covenant and law proves them unfit to know or teach the will of God.⁶⁶ Justin in this way aligns his differentiation between those who understand the Jewish scriptures and those who do not with a distinction between Jews and non-Jews, as if these two types of contrasts were complementary (cf. *1 Apol.* 49.1–5; 53.5–8; *Dial.* 11.4–12.2; 24.3–4; 34.1–6; 78.10–11; 114.2–5).

Elsewhere in his writings, Justin frequently draws a similar type of contrast between the imperceptiveness of Jews and the perceptiveness of non-Jews. He almost invariably denounces the Jewish nation as a whole and repeatedly describes their failure to understand the true message of the Jewish scriptures.⁶⁷ To be sure, Justin recognizes that a small number of Jews have come to believe in Jesus as Messiah (*1 Apol.* 53.3–12; *Dial.* 39.2; 55.3), and he hopes that others will too (*Dial.* 32.2; 125.1). Despite this positive affirmation, Justin still identifies Jews who believe in Jesus as an exceptional few whom God spared so that the Jewish race would not be completely obliterated (*1 Apol.* 53.7–8; *Dial.* 55.3; 32.2).⁶⁸ When it comes to non-Jews, Justin asserts that scriptural prophecy predicts that “the nations” (τὰ ἔθνη) would be especially predisposed to recognizing and embracing the message of how Christ fulfilled the scriptures.⁶⁹ Accordingly, even though Justin recognizes that some Jews believe in Jesus, he frequently contrasts non-Jewish Christ-believers with Jews, as if these two designations served as fitting labels for insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community, respectively.⁷⁰

⁶⁶ See citation and discussion of *Dial.* 123.2–4 below.

⁶⁷ E.g., *1 Apol.* 31.5; 36.3; 37.1; 49.1–7; 53.6–12; 63.1–3; *Dial.* 12.2–3; 27.3; 32.5; 34.1; 38.2; 55.3; 62.2–3; 68.7; 78.10–11; 83.1; 93.5; 110.1–2; 112.2–4; 113.1; 114.3; 117.4; 120.5; 123.2–3; 126.1–2; 134.1–2; 136.2–3; 140.1–2.

⁶⁸ In *Dial.* 39.1–5 and 55.3, Justin admits that an exceptional few Jews will be saved but at the same time tells Trypho that Jews, on the whole, remain unable to understand the Jewish scriptures. In this way, he acknowledges the salvation of some Jews while also sustaining his contrast between the correct understanding of the scriptures by Christ-believers and the misunderstanding of Jews.

⁶⁹ *1 Apol.* 31.7–8; 32.4; 39.3; 40.7; 42.3–4; 49.5; 53.3–12; *Dial.* 11.4; 12.1–2; 41.2–3; 109.1–110.2; 120.4–5; 121.1–4; 122.1–6; 130.1–4. For further discussion of this sentiment in the writings of Justin, see David Rokeah, *Justin Martyr and the Jews* (Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 5; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 10–11.

⁷⁰ E.g., *1 Apol.* 31.5–7; 49.1–5; 53.3–12; *Dial.* 12.1–2; 41.2–3; 108.1–109.3; 122.1–123.4. At times, Justin also draws a contrast between Jews and Christians. See, e.g., *Dial.* 78.10–11; 93.4–5; 96.1–2; 117.1–3. This type of contrast also aligns Jews with

At first sight, Luke appears to develop a similar distinction between Jews and non-Jews, especially in the scenes where he has Paul report that he will transfer his ministry to τὰ ἔθνη (Acts 13:46–47; 18:6; 28:25–28).⁷¹ Nevertheless, in each of these episodes, Luke seems to avoid drawing a clear-cut distinction between τὰ ἔθνη and οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι. For example, even though Luke indicates in Acts 13:42–47 that some Jews reject the message of Paul, he also reports that other Jews in this setting embrace his proclamation of the Jewish scriptures.⁷² Again, in Acts 18:4–8, Luke indicates that some Jews oppose Paul but at the same time reports the positive response of other Jews.⁷³ Even at the end of

outsiders and perhaps finds its fullest expression in the debate between Trypho and Justin. In *Dial.* 39.1–5, for example, Justin tells Trypho that “you (i.e., you Jews) hate us (i.e., us Christians) who have grasped the meaning of these truths (i.e., the truths of scripture)...you (Jews) ‘who are wise in your own eyes and prudent in your own sight’ (Isa 5:21), are in reality stupid.... We (Christians), on the other hand,...have been well instructed in his whole truth” (cf. *Dial.* 32.5; 41.2–3; 64.1; 77.3; 78.10–11; 82.1; 87.5; 88.1; 92.4; 108.1–3; 131.2).

⁷¹ There is a long-standing debate over the significance of Paul’s repeated announcements that he is turning to non-Jews. The major proponents of the view that Luke portrays the replacement of Jews with non-Jews in Acts 13:46–47, 18:4–6, and 28:23–28 are well known. Haenchen, *Acts*, 100–3, 414, 417–8, 730, argues that the book of Acts shows a progression of the gospel from Jews to non-Jews. He maintains that Acts 13:46–47 serves as a pattern of Jewish rejection, which is repeated on similar occasions (Acts 18:6; 19:9; 28:28); cf. Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 39–41, 53, 77–83; Loisy, *Actes*, 938–40; Wilson, *Gentile Mission*, 222–4; Tyson, *Images of Judaism*, 142–4. By contrast, Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 41–74, argues that the conversion of Jews takes place alongside reports of opposition, which also come from Jews. He notes the repetition of this pattern in chapters 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, and 17 of Acts and asserts that the gospel produces a division among Jews; cf. idem, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (KEK 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 621. Others, like Jervell, understand the conflict in Acts as an inner-Jewish struggle. See, e.g., David L. Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 48–9; Robert L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* (SBLMS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 35–50; J. Dupont, *Études sur les Actes des apôtres* (Paris: Cerf, 1967), 343–9, 457–511. While not wishing to deny that Luke here portrays a Jewish rejection of the message of Paul, I hope to highlight that the divisions in Acts 13:46–47, 18:4–6, and 28:23–28 occur in response to Paul’s message and interpretation of the scriptures and to demonstrate that Luke does not draw as firm a distinction between Jews and non-Jewish Christ-believers as Justin does.

⁷² The sermon of Paul in Acts 13:13–41, which focuses upon biblical history and scriptural interpretation, is the referent of ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου and ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ in Acts 13:42–47.

⁷³ The synagogue context suggests that Paul’s attention to “the word” included the study and interpretation of the Jewish scriptures. Some translations appear to interpret ἐπειθὲν in Acts 18:4 as a conative imperfect and thus take it to mean that Paul was “trying to persuade” Jews and Greeks in the synagogue on the Sabbath (see, e.g., NRSV, NIV). If this is the meaning that Luke intends, it is not certain that Paul was successful in his attempt to persuade people. Nevertheless, since Luke subsequently

Acts, where Luke has Paul cite Isa 6:9–10 to denounce Jews who do not understand, or reject, his interpretation of the scriptures, he still reports that some Jews believe the message of Paul (Acts 28:24). Thus, even in instances where Luke contrasts the rejection of the message and scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers by Jews with its positive reception by non-Jews, he resists portraying Jews as unequivocal ‘others’, or outsiders to the Christ-believing community. Furthermore, Luke elsewhere presents a positive correlation between the Jewish reception of the message of Paul and astuteness in scriptural interpretation: those Jews who examined the scriptures carefully were convinced of the truth of Paul’s message.⁷⁴ Thus, although Luke describes the rejection of the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers by some Jews, he does not align his distinction between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community with a contrast between non-Jews and Jews in the same way that Justin does.

A comparison of Acts 13:27–28 and *1 Apol.* 31.5 further illustrates this difference between Luke and Justin:

οἱ γὰρ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν τοῦτον ἀγνοήσαντες καὶ τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας κρίναντες ἐπλήρωσαν, καὶ μηδεμίαν αἰτίαν θανάτου εὗροντες ᾗτήσαντο Πιλάτον ἀναιρεθῆναι αὐτόν.

For those who lived in Jerusalem and their rulers, because they did not understand him nor the words of the prophets that are read every Sabbath, fulfilled (those words) by condemning (him). And although they found no cause for death, they asked Pilate to have him executed. (Acts 13:27–28)

καὶ τούτου γενομένου ἔμειναν αἱ βίβλοι καὶ παρ’ Αἰγυπτίοις μέχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, καὶ πανταχοῦ παρὰ πᾶσιν εἰσιν Ἰουδαίοις, οἳ καὶ ἀναγινώσκοντες οὐ συνιάσι τὰ εἰρημένα, ἀλλ’ ἐχθροὺς ἡμᾶς καὶ πολεμίους ἡγοῦνται,

reports that Crispus, the synagogue leader, and his household were baptized (Acts 18:8); it appears that some Jews were persuaded by the message of Paul.

⁷⁴ For example, although Luke indicates that “some” Jews in Thessalonica believe (Acts 17:4; cf. Acts 28:24), he reports that “many” Jews in Berea believe (Acts 17:12) and attributes the positive response of the latter group to their attentiveness to the Jewish scriptures: “These Jews were more receptive than those in Thessalonica, for they welcomed the message very eagerly and examined the scriptures every day to see whether these things were so. Many of them therefore believed, including not a few Greek women and men of high standing” (Acts 17:11–12). Compare this positive reception with the rejection of the message of Paul by some non-Jews (e.g., Acts 13:50; 14:2, 4–5; 18:4; 19:10–20).

ὁμοίως ὑμῖν ἀναιροῦντες καὶ κολάζοντες ἡμᾶς ὅποταν δύνωνται, ὥς καὶ πεισθῆναι δύνασθε.

And after this happened (i.e., the translation of the LXX), the scrolls remained among the Egyptians until now, and are among all Jews everywhere, who, even though they read (them), do not understand what has been said, but consider us (non-Jewish Christians) to be enemies and adversaries, and like you (Justin's non-Jewish audience), they execute and punish us whenever they are able, as you also are able to learn.

(*1 Apol.* 31.5)

Although these accounts take place in very different contexts—Justin describes the translation of the LXX whereas Luke has Paul preach a sermon to Diaspora Jews—both present a similar trajectory: Jews had the scriptures in their possession, but failed to understand them and so acted out violently against Christ, or Christ-believers. Nevertheless, whereas Luke describes the misunderstanding and guilt of “residents of Jerusalem and their leaders,” Justin makes a global statement about the misperception and culpability of *all Jews everywhere*.⁷⁵ If Justin relies on Lukan thought to describe the incomprehension of Jews in *1 Apol.* 31.5, he appears to develop his portrait of the Jewish misunderstanding of the scriptures beyond the characterization of Jews in Luke-Acts. Moreover, in the passage that follows (*1 Apol.* 31.7–8), Justin asserts that the “books of the prophets” predicted that “certain persons were sent by him (Christ) to proclaim these things (about how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures) to every race of humans, and that those from the nations rather (than Jews) would believe in him” (*1 Apol.* 31.7–8). Justin in this way reiterates his distinction between the misunderstanding of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι and the perceptiveness of τὰ ἔθνη, and attempts to present both of these outcomes as complementary realizations of the fulfillment of prophecy.⁷⁶

⁷⁵ This difference is all the more notable when we remember that, for Luke, large numbers of Jerusalem Jews repent and believe on Jesus after his death. See, e.g., Acts 2:41; 5:14; 21:20.

⁷⁶ Subsequently, in *1 Apology* 32, Justin reiterates this perspective by arguing that the phrase “The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler’s staff from between his feet, until he comes to whom it belongs” in Gen 49:10 foretells the end of Jewish leadership and the beginning of a new era in which the promised descendent of Judah would become the “expectation of nations.” Through this line of argumentation, Justin transforms the prophecy into a negative prediction for Jews and a positive prediction for the nations.

4.5 DIFFERING APPLICATIONS OF THE DEUTERONOMISTIC PRINCIPLE

The differences between the way that Luke and Justin configure a division between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community correspond, in part, to the differing ways that they interpret and apply the Deuteronomistic principle. O. H. Steck has argued that a Deuteronomistic concept of prophecy permeates early Jewish and NT literature (200 BCE–100 CE). He maintains that authors of these texts drew upon certain elements of the scriptural accounts of the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles in order to depict the repetition of the following pattern in their writings: the disobedience of Israel, the warning of Israel through the prophets of the Lord, the rejection and persecution of these prophets, and the consequent punishment when Israel did not heed these warnings.⁷⁷ This view of Israel's history helps authors of early Jewish and Christian literature to describe the *en masse* disobedience of corporate Israel over against the covenant fidelity of a select group who recognize their leaders as prophetic mediators of the message of God.⁷⁸ The eschatological orientation of a number of these texts heightens their depiction of this division: those who listen to the prophetic warnings of God's messengers represent the chosen few who comprise the true people of God whereas the rest of Israel experiences a final exclusion because of its infidelity.

The observations of Steck provide a useful framework for comparing and contrasting the way that Luke and Justin apply scriptural prophecies of blessing and judgment. In his narrative, Luke portrays a division between Jews on the basis of their response to the prophetic

⁷⁷ Odil Hannes Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (WMANT 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967), 60–80, 153–69. Steck sees the beginning of this pattern emerging already in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., 2 Kings 17; Nehemiah 9). He surveys a number of early Jewish texts, including those that have an eschatological or apocalyptic orientation. Notably, he discusses the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85–90), the Apocalypse of Weeks (93:1–10; 91:12–19), and select passages from the so-called sectarian documents from Qumran. See especially his discussions of 1QS 1–2; 8; CD 1:3–13; 7:17–18; 1QpHab 2:9.

⁷⁸ Although Steck, *Israel*, 169, argues that the Qumran group directs the final call to repentance to the community alone, rather than to all Israel, the descriptions of the incorporation of new adherents to the community (1QS 5:8–25; 6:13–27; 1Q28a 1–2) suggest that the group thought that outsiders could join and in this way become part of the elect.

message and scriptural interpretation of Jesus. Likewise, he indicates that the inclusion of non-Jews within the Christ-believing community depends upon their positive reception of this same proclamation. Both types of groups thus experience inclusion within or exclusion from the Christ-believing community as a result of their responses to the warning and scriptural interpretation of God's messengers. By contrast, because Justin typically creates a distinction between non-Jews and Jews, he interprets prophetic texts that evoke a Deuteronomic warning of judgment for obdurate Jews as predictions about or descriptions of the Jewish nation as a whole. Correspondingly, he applies prophetic oracles of salvation and blessing to non-Jews who believe in Jesus.⁷⁹

4.5.1 Luke: "You Are Like Your Ancestors"

Throughout his narrative, Luke characterizes Jewish Christ-believers as those who stand in continuity with the ancient prophets and faithful Israel of the past, and Jews who do not believe in Jesus as descendants of Jewish ancestors who rejected the prophets and therefore incurred God's wrath.⁸⁰ Luke further heightens the urgency of hearing and obeying the message of Jesus by portraying him as the eschatological prophet like Moses.⁸¹ Jews who fail to repent when they hear the message of Jesus forfeit their status as the people of God whereas those who hear and obey it experience inclusion within the community.⁸² Since the scriptural interpretation of Jesus and his followers forms part of their

⁷⁹ In contrast to my argument, Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 326–7, maintains that Acts transforms the prophetic model of judgment into a denunciation of "the Jews" as a whole. For Pervo, this characteristic of Acts demonstrates the close affinity between the context of the author and that of the Apostolic Fathers and early Christian apologists.

⁸⁰ Steck, *Israel*, 50–8, 266–9, also notes this theme in Luke and Acts. He draws the conclusion that the purpose of the speeches to Jews in Acts was to call the people to return from sin to covenantal relationship with God. For further discussion of the development of this theme in Luke-Acts, see David P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 82–222; Tiede, *Prophecy and History*, 42–55; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (Missoula: Scholars, 1977), 79–126.

⁸¹ Of course, as noted in Chapter Two, Luke portrays Jesus as more than a prophet. His emphasis on this aspect of his identity, however, serves to portray a division between Christ-believing and non-Christ-believing Jews on the basis of their response to the message and scriptural interpretation of Jesus and his followers.

⁸² Johnson, *Literary Function*, 124, maintains that salvation is offered to Jews a first time through the message of Jesus and a second time through the message of his followers; cf. David P. Moessner, "'The Christ Must Suffer': New Light on the Jesus-Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts," *NovT* 28 (1986): 226.

prophetic message, their exegesis functions as a dividing agent within this framework.

Several examples illustrate the role of exegesis in the development of this theme in the gospel of Luke. Luke presents Jesus as a prophetic figure who experiences a rejection of his interpretation of the Jewish scriptures at the very outset of his mission (Luke 4:16–30). Throughout the course of his ministry, Jesus also encounters opposition because he challenges the teaching and practices of those who were regarded as experts in the Law (cf. Luke 6:1–11; 11:37–54; 13:10–17; 14:1–6).⁸³ As he travels toward Jerusalem, Jesus anticipates further opposition and suffering upon his arrival because of the city's refusal to recognize his prophetic visitation (Luke 13:31–35; cf. 11:49–50; 19:41–44).⁸⁴ When Jesus finally reaches Jerusalem, the climactic destination of his journey as a prophet (Luke 13:32–33), he immediately enters the temple and begins to teach there (Luke 19:45–47; cf. 20:1; 21:37). In this setting, Luke again portrays the exposition of the Jewish scriptures as a significant part of the message of Jesus (Luke 20:9–19, 27–40, 41–44; 21:5–33).⁸⁵ Although many Jerusalem Jews respond favorably to him (Luke 19:48; 20:21; 21:38),⁸⁶ their leaders reject his teaching (Luke 19:47; 20:1–7, 19, 26).⁸⁷ Subsequently, at the trial of Jesus, Luke presents his teaching as the primary cause of his rejection.⁸⁸ The prophetic

⁸³ Some similar descriptions occur in the other synoptic gospels. Compare Luke 6:1–11 with Matt 10:1–4; 12:1–14 and Mark 2:23–3:6. There are no parallels with Luke 13:10–17 and 14:1–6.

⁸⁴ No parallels with Matthew or Mark.

⁸⁵ Note especially the oracles outlined in Luke 21:5–33. In this passage, the Lukan Jesus describes his prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem as the “fulfillment of all that is written” (Luke 21:22).

⁸⁶ Matthew and Mark have no parallels to Luke 19:48 and 21:38. Luke 20:21 also elaborates on the positive qualities of the teaching of Jesus more than Matt 22:16 or Mark 12:14.

⁸⁷ Parallel scenes occur in Matthew and Mark, but only Luke emphasizes this activity by repeatedly indicating that Jesus taught daily in the temple (Luke 19:47; 20:1; 21:37).

⁸⁸ Although the people of Jerusalem initially respond favorably to the message and scriptural interpretation of Jesus, Luke implicates both the people and their leaders in his death (Luke 23:13–25). In Acts, Luke indicates that the Jerusalem Jews reject Jesus and instigate his death (e.g., Acts 2:23; 3:14–15; 4:27–28), but he also describes the repentance of large numbers of Jerusalem Jews (Acts 2:41; 5:14; 21:20). Their repentance distinguishes them as part of the faithful over against those who reject the scriptural interpretation of the followers of Jesus (e.g., Acts 2:37–41; 4:1–22). Johnson, *Literary Function*, 79–126 argues that a primary division within Israel occurred between the leaders, who rejected Jesus, and the rest of the people. So also Gerhard Lohfink, *Die Sammlung Israel: Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (Münich: Kösel,

message and exegesis of Jesus thus produces a division among the Jewish people.

In Acts 2–3, Luke more pointedly outlines this division. Here he depicts the proclamation and scriptural interpretation of Peter as another opportunity for the Jerusalem Jews to repent and accept the message of Jesus (Acts 2:17–36; 3:11–26). This perspective is especially vivid in Acts 3:11–26 where Peter exhorts his fellow-Jews to recognize how the scriptures were fulfilled through the suffering of Christ (Acts 3:17–19) and to listen to Jesus, the eschatological prophet like Moses (Acts 3:22; cf. Deut 18:15, 18).⁸⁹ In this context, Peter utters an ominous warning: “And it will be that everyone who does not listen to that prophet will be utterly destroyed out of the people” (Acts 3:23; cf. Deut 18:19; Lev 23:29). By adding the phrase ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ (Lev 23:29) to the citation of Deut 18:19, Luke has Peter accentuate the dire and final consequence of failing to heed the message of Jesus—exclusion from the people of God.⁹⁰ Furthermore, the addition of ἔσται δέ to the beginning of his citation of Deut 18:19 makes it roughly parallel to καὶ ἔσται in Acts 2:21. This link between Acts

1975), 41–2, who argues that Luke depicts a gap between the people and their leaders throughout the gospel of Luke. Lohfink rightly observes, however, that this contrast disappears in Luke 23:13–25 where Luke implicates both the leaders and the people in the death of Jesus. Note especially the way that Luke has Jews accuse Jesus falsely and portrays their determination to see his destruction (Luke 23:18, 21, 23).

⁸⁹ For further discussion of this passage, see Chapter Two.

⁹⁰ The phrase ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ in Lev 23:29 refers to those who fail to observe the day of atonement, but Luke has Peter apply it to those who fail to listen to Jesus, the prophet like Moses. Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 54, argues that Luke depicts the rejection of the message of Jesus and the apostles as “a purging of the unrepentant portion of the people from Israel.” He asserts that, for Luke, believing Jews comprise Israel whereas unbelieving Jews forfeit their right to be part of Israel. Similarly, Tiede, *Prophecy and History*, 122, argues that the indication that those who do not listen will be destroyed (Acts 3:23) does not mean that the people as a whole will be abandoned. Lohfink, *Sammlung*, 60–1, argues that the summons of Peter in Acts 3:17–26 represents the ultimate call to repentance and the means by which Israel is judged and gathered: “Glauben sie an Jesus, so bleiben sie in dem Segen, der auf Israel liegt. Glauben sie nicht, so werden sie aus dem Volke ausgerottet, das heißt, sie hören auf, Mitglieder des Gottesvolkes zu sein. Das Geschehen seit Pfingsten ist also nichts anderes als die letzte und tiefgreifendste Krisis Israels” (61). Those who respond positively to the message of Peter in Acts 3:17–26 become true Israel and heirs of the promises of God outlined therein whereas those who reject his message forfeit their status as Israel. In light of other passages throughout Luke-Acts that stress the need to hear, understand, and obey the message of Jesus and the apostles, and their interpretation of the Jewish scriptures, Acts 3:22–23 can be understood as a reorientation of the identity of the people of God that is based upon the correct understanding of, and response to, the will of God as it is expressed by Jesus, the prophet like Moses.

2:21 and 3:23 coordinates the positive statement about eschatological inclusion within the people of God in Acts 2:21 (cf. LXX Joel 3:5)—“And it shall be (καὶ ἔσται) that everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved”—with the negative statement about exclusion in Acts 3:23—“And it shall be (ἔσται δέ) that every person who does not listen to the prophet like Moses shall be cut off from the people.”⁹¹ Taken together, Acts 2:21 and 3:23 demonstrate how Luke portrays a division among Jews on the basis of their contrasting responses to the message and exegesis of Jesus and his followers. Those Jews who hear and respond positively to the message of how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures will experience scriptural promises of salvation (Acts 2:21) whereas those who do not listen will experience the exclusion from God’s people that the Jewish scriptures foretell (Acts 3:22–23).

The speech of Stephen (Acts 7) and the sermon of Paul (Acts 28) further illustrate this pattern of division. Luke portrays Stephen as a prophetic spokesperson within a long line of righteous ancestors and prophets (Joseph, Moses, Jesus). In his lengthy review of biblical history, the Lukan Stephen expresses a Deuteronomistic perspective on Israel’s past rejection of the messengers of God (cf. 2 Kgs 17:7–20; Neh 9:26; 2 Chron 36:14–16).⁹² He argues that just as former Israelites received “living oracles” from Moses but refused to obey them (Acts 7:38–39),⁹³ so his accusers both killed Christ and refused to keep the law (Acts 7:51–53).⁹⁴ Moreover, throughout the speech, Stephen

⁹¹ Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (SNT 1; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn/Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1969), 66–7; R. J. Dillon, “The Prophecy of Christ and his Witnesses according to the Discourses of Acts,” *NTS* 32 (1986): 547.

⁹² Steck, *Israel*, 66–8, 74–7; Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet*, 300–2; Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 260–2; Bock, *Acts*, 277.

⁹³ See also the description of the rejection of Joseph by his brothers (Acts 7:9–16).

⁹⁴ The dispute surrounding the arrest of Stephen appears to be related to opposing interpretations of the Mosaic law. False witnesses accuse Stephen of speaking against the Law (Acts 6:11, 13–14) and Stephen accuses his opponents of not keeping the Law, and of opposing the Holy Spirit and the prophets (Acts 7:51–53). Ernst Haenchen, “Judentum und Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte,” *ZNW* 54 (1963): 165–6, argues that the purpose of the speech of Stephen was to establish Christ-believers as those who were truly in continuity with the Jewish scriptures and to represent other Jews as deviant. Heinz-Werner Neudorfer, “The Speech of Stephen,” in *Witness to the Gospel*, 281–3, argues that the speech of Stephen expresses harsh criticism of his opponents but maintains solidarity between Jewish Christ-believers and their Jewish heritage. He suggests that the denunciation of Jews by the Lukan Stephen resembles Josephus’s conclusion that the violation of the temple and law by Jews led to the military invasion

describes Abraham as “our ancestor” (Acts 7:2), and other patriarchs and ancient Israelite leaders as “our ancestors” (Acts 7:11, 12, 15, 19, 38, 39, 44, 45 [2x]),⁹⁵ thereby expressing his solidarity with other Jews. This pattern shifts in Acts 7:51–53, however, where Stephen identifies past Israelites who resisted Moses and other prophets with his opponents by calling them “your ancestors”:

Σκληροτράχηλοι καὶ ἀπερίτμητοι καρδίαις καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν, ὑμεῖς ἀεὶ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ ἀντιπίπτετε ὡς οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν καὶ ὑμεῖς. τίνα τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ ἐδίωξαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν; καὶ ἀπέκτειναν τοὺς προκαταγγεῖλαντας περὶ τῆς ἐλεύσεως τοῦ δικαίου, οὗ νῦν ὑμεῖς προδότες καὶ φονεῖς ἐγένεσθε, οἵτινες ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων καὶ οὐκ ἐφυλάξατε.

You stubborn people, uncircumcised in heart and ears, you always resist the Holy Spirit, as *your* ancestors so also you. Which of the prophets did your ancestors not persecute? They killed those who previously announced the coming of the Righteous One, whose betrayers and murderers you have now become, you who received the law as ordained by angels and did not keep it.
(Acts 7:51–53)

By changing from “our ancestors” to “your ancestors,” Stephen identifies his audience, but not himself or his group, with a particular segment of the Jewish people: namely, those Jews who disobeyed the Mosaic law and resisted the prophets.⁹⁶ As C. K. Barrett concludes:

by the Romans (e.g., *Jewish War* 5:376–419, 451); cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:336. As Johnson, *Acts*, 120, notes, other early Jewish texts such as *Jubilees*, *Genesis Apocryphon*, and the *Damascus Document* review biblical history in a similar way.

⁹⁵ Some manuscripts omit ἡμῶν in Acts 7:19. Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition* (Stuttgart, UBS, 1998), 303, suggests that external evidence favors the omission but notes that the preceding ἡμῶν (four words earlier) may have led to its omission by copyists. The phrase “our fathers” also appears in other speeches in Acts (13:17; 15:10; 22:14; 26:6).

⁹⁶ G. Stanton, “Stephen in Lucan Perspective,” in *Studia Biblica III Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors. Sixth International Congress on Biblical Studies. Oxford, 3–7 April 1978* (JSNTSup 3; ed., E. A. Livingstone; Sheffield: JSOT, 1981), 352–4, draws a similar conclusion and adopts the variant reading οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν in Acts 7:39 (found in Irenaeus, Ψ, 81) rather than οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν; cf. Franklin, *Christ the Lord*, 104; A. F. J. Klijn, “Stephen’s Speech—Acts VII.2–53,” *NTS* 4 (1957–1958): 25–31. Although manuscript evidence for this conclusion is weak, the sudden shift in the portrayal of ancestry in Acts 7:51–53 supports the thesis that Luke sees a division in ancestry that corresponds to the division between Jews who believe in Jesus and other Jews. Moreover, Luke has Jesus denounce similar opponents by identifying them with Jewish ancestors that killed the prophets: “So you are witnesses and approve of the deeds of *your* ancestors; for they killed them, and you build their tombs” (Luke 11:48). See also the references to “their ancestors” in Luke 6:23, 26.

They share a common origin in the call of Abraham, in God's promise to him, and in the fulfillment of the promise in the living oracles given to Moses; but Christianity belongs to that critical prophetic strand of Judaism which refused to substitute institutions for the word of God, and claims that the final conflict between the two came to a head in the story of Jesus.⁹⁷

Luke presents the opponents of Stephen as heirs of those who persecuted the prophets (Acts 7:51) and disregarded the Mosaic law (Acts 7:53), but portrays Stephen and, by implication, the Christ-believing community as successors of righteous people and prophets who were persecuted at the hands of obdurate Jews. In faithfulness to the God of Israel, Stephen proclaims the message of Jesus and the correct interpretation of the scriptures (7:1–53) and, as a result, experiences the death of a prophet (7:54–60).⁹⁸

Similarly, as noted above, the Lukan Paul cites and interprets Isa 6:9–10 in order to attribute the inability of Jews to understand his message to a chronic hardness and imperceptivity that began with their ancestors (Acts 28:23–28).⁹⁹ By referring to those who rejected the message of Isaiah as “*your* ancestors” (Acts 28:25), Paul draws an implicit contrast between his own heritage and the lineage of those who reject his message.¹⁰⁰ Whereas Paul stands in continuity with the prophet Isaiah, and functions as a representative of the group who remains faithful to the scriptures and message of God, Jews who reject his message stand in continuity with their ancestors who did not listen to or perceive the message of Isaiah.¹⁰¹ The past rejection of the prophet Isaiah by Jews thus serves as a scriptural precedent that explains the

⁹⁷ Barrett, *Acts*, 1:340.

⁹⁸ For discussion of the links between the rejection or martyrdom of Moses, Jesus, and Stephen, see Johnson, *Acts*, 135–44.

⁹⁹ See citation and discussion of Acts 28:25–27 above.

¹⁰⁰ Although the Lukan Paul elsewhere refers to the predecessors of fellow-Jews as “our ancestors” (Acts 13:17; 22:14; 26:6) in Acts 28:25, he distinguishes between his heritage and the ancestry of those who reject his message by referring to the latter as “your ancestors.”

¹⁰¹ See also Luke 6:23: “Rejoice in that day and leap for joy, for surely your reward is great in heaven; for that is what their ancestors did to the prophets”; 11:48: “So you are witnesses and approve of the deeds of your ancestors; for they killed them, and you build their tombs”; 13:33–34: “Yet today, tomorrow, and the next day I must be on my way, because it is impossible for a prophet to be killed outside of Jerusalem. Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the city that kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to it! How often have I desired to gather your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you were not willing”; Acts 7:51–53 (cited above).

present behavior of those who reject the message and scriptural interpretation of Paul.¹⁰²

Rather than radically changing this framework to account for the inclusion of non-Jews, Luke continues to portray the acceptance of the message of the followers of Jesus as the basis for determining who belongs to the Christ-believing community. The transition and geographical movement outward from Jerusalem in Acts 8–11 shows the initial stages of the progression of the message to non-Jews.¹⁰³ In Acts 8:1–24, for example, Luke describes the proclamation of the “word of God” to Samaritans (Acts 8:1–24), a marginal group insofar as Luke distinguishes them from Jews living in Judaea.¹⁰⁴ Similarly, in his story of the Ethiopian official, Luke depicts Philip as a prophetic messenger who mediates the correct interpretation of the scriptures to a figure who stood on the margins of Judaism (Acts 8:26–40).¹⁰⁵

The message of Peter to Cornelius in Acts 10:34–43 provides a paradigmatic example of the extension of this prophetic program. Peter

¹⁰² As Bock, *Acts*, 755, argues, Luke casts Paul in the role of Isaiah and those who reject him in the role of those who rejected the prophet Isaiah. Acts 28:25–28 thus functions as a warning for Jews rather than a final denunciation of the nation as a whole. See also Moessner, “Christ Must Suffer,” 254, who concludes that Luke portrays Paul as a “prophetic pleader of repentance to Israel” in this scene.

¹⁰³ Scholars often note the geographical movement outward from Jerusalem in Acts 8–11 and suggest that this section of the narrative represents the transition from a Jewish to a non-Jewish mission, and the fulfillment of the prediction of Jesus in Acts 1:8. See, e.g., Haenchen, *Acts*, 314; Conzelmann, *Acts*, xliii; Johnson, *Acts*, 150; Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 2003), 134. For a discussion of the mission to the Samaritans in Acts as part of the restoration of Israel, see David Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (JSNTSup 119; Sheffield: SAP, 1995), 72–92; cf. Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 129; Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 123, 128.

¹⁰⁴ Although the mission to the Samaritans marks a new stage in the narrative, Luke appears to regard Samaritans as distinct from non-Jews, since he clearly identifies Cornelius and his household as the first group of non-Jews whom God visits and chooses (Acts 15:14). Luke at times presents Samaritans in a favorable light and as participants in Jerusalem temple worship (Luke 10:33–37; 17:11–19) but he also records an instance of tension between the Samaritans and the disciples (Luke 9:52–56). Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 400, describes Samaritans as a group that was “remotely related to Judaism.” Similarly, Barrett, *Acts*, 1:396, suggests that they were not Jews but “by no means totally different from or unrelated to them.” A number of other scholars suggest that Luke regards the Samaritans as representatives of the “lost sheep” or outcasts of Israel who were in need of restoration. See, e.g., Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 126–7; Marshall, *Acts*, 153. Ravens, *Restoration of Israel*, 72–92, argues that Luke intended to present the inclusion of the Samaritans as the restoration of the divided kingdom; cf. Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 129.

¹⁰⁵ For further discussion of Acts 8:26–40, see Chapter Two.

receives divine direction to go to Cornelius, and those gathered to hear his message regard Peter as a divinely inspired emissary who speaks for God: “So now all of us are here in the presence of God to listen to all that the Lord has commanded you to say” (Acts 10:33b). In the speech that follows, moreover, Peter appears to expound the scriptures in his role as a messenger of God. Although some conclude that the absence of explicit scriptural citations in the speech indicates that Luke has omitted this element in the Cornelius account,¹⁰⁶ others correctly point out that the speech contains a number of scriptural allusions.¹⁰⁷ Since Acts 10:34–43 is probably intended to represent a main outline rather than a complete record of the content of the speech, these allusions to the Jewish scriptures serve as important indicators of the subject matter of the speech.¹⁰⁸ The concluding words of Peter further suggest that Luke wishes to portray scriptural exposition as a central part of his message: “All the prophets testify about him that everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name.”¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁶ See, e.g., Rese, *Alttestamentliche*, 117, who attributes this absence to the type of audience, namely, a non-Jewish one. See also U. Wilckens, *Die Missionreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Neukirchener: Verlag, 1974), 50, who suggests that there are no citations of scripture because the message of Peter is not a sermon but a report about the life of Jesus. Similarly, Joseph B. Tyson, “The Gentile Mission and Scripture in Acts,” *NTS* 35 (1987): 628, argues that “scripture plays almost no role whatsoever” in the Cornelius episode.

¹⁰⁷ Dibelius, *Studies*, 111, concludes that the speech of Peter in Acts 10:34–43 parallels the format of other speeches in Acts by including kerygma (Acts 10:37–41), proof from scriptures (Acts 10:43b), and an exhortation to repentance (Acts 10:42, 43a). Compare especially Acts 10:36–38 with Luke 4:18–19. As Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (JSNTSup 12; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 233–5, observes, the terminology in Acts 10:36–38 alludes to both Luke 4:16–18 and to LXX Isa 61:1. Note the repetition of ἀποστέλλω, χρίω, κηρύσσω, and εὐαγγελίζω in all three contexts. Graham Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching* (SNTSMS 25; Cambridge: CUP, 1974), 67–85, also suggests that Acts 10:36 alludes to Ps 107:21, Acts 10:38a to Isa 61:1, and possibly to Isa 52:4, Acts 10:38b to Gen 39:21, Acts 10:38c to Ps 107:20, and Acts 10:39 to Deut 21:22–23.

¹⁰⁸ As Richard I. Pervo, *Acts* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009), 277, explains, the speech is compressed and provides only a brief outline of what was said; cf. Marion L. Soards, *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994), 70–7. Accordingly, the allusions and references to scripture prove significant for determining what the speech in its entirety would have contained; namely, a proclamation of Jesus and his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures.

¹⁰⁹ This statement recalls Luke 24:46–47 (εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι Οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν . . . κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἅφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ). As such, it strongly suggests that Luke wishes to present the speech of Peter as a form of scriptural exposition commensurate with the message that Christ first commissioned the disciples to proclaim. Furthermore,

In fulfillment of his role as a type of messenger from God, then, Peter communicates what the Lord commanded him to say, a proclamation that included the declaration of how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures.

As with the Jewish people, so the response of non-Jews to the message and scriptural interpretation of the followers of Jesus serves as a qualifying criterion for their inclusion within the Christ-believing community. In the case of Cornelius and his household, for example, Luke indicates on more than one occasion that they experience inclusion as a result of their acceptance of and faith in the message of Peter.¹¹⁰ Similarly, when Luke has Paul announce that he will turn to non-Jews with the “word of God,” he portrays his subsequent message as parallel to his preaching to Jews (e.g., Acts 13:46–47; cf. 18:5–6; 28:25–28). Throughout his mission to non-Jews, the message and exegesis of Paul evoke the same type of divided response as it did from Jews.¹¹¹ Although, in some instances, Luke indicates that non-Jews respond more positively than do Jews,¹¹² he typically presents the mission to non-Jews as the continuation of the message and scriptural interpretation that God first sent to Jews through Jesus; even as Jesus

in his sermon, Peter describes the ministry of Jesus (Acts 10:36–38) and presents himself as a witness who was commissioned to continue this work (Acts 10:39–43). In Acts 10:39–42, the description of the disciples’ role as witnesses (ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες πάντων... μάρτυσιν τοῖς προκεχειροτονημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ) recalls the earlier scenes in his narrative where Jesus interpreted the Jewish scriptures for them, and commissioned them as witnesses of his resurrection and of his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures (Luke 24:48 ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων; Acts 1:8 ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες).

¹¹⁰ Luke repeatedly emphasizes this criterion when rehearsing the story of Cornelius. In Acts 11:1b, he summarizes the event by indicating that “the Gentiles had also accepted the word of God.” In Acts 15, Luke has Peter explain that the action of God in sending the Spirit to Cornelius and his household signified his equal acceptance of both Jewish and non-Jewish believers on the basis of their faith in his message (Acts 15:7–9; cf. 10:47; 11:15). In Acts 15:8, Peter explains that God bore witness to Cornelius and his household by giving them the Spirit. The immediate context of Acts 15:7b suggests that God affirmed this group as a result of their hearing of and faith in his message: “God made a choice among you, that I should be the one through whom the Gentiles would hear the message of the good news and become believers.” Barrett, *Acts*, 2:715, argues that the context of Acts 15:7–9 suggests that “God bore witness to the fact that Cornelius had fulfilled all the conditions (hearing and believing the Word) necessary for being a Christian, and thus was qualified to receive the Holy Spirit.” Luke thus indicates that the favorable attitude of God toward those who fear him and do what is right (Acts 10:34) depends upon their positive response to the message proclaimed by God’s appointed representative.

¹¹¹ See, e.g., Acts 13:50; 14:2, 4–5; 18:4; 19:10–20.

¹¹² Note especially the final assertion of Paul in Acts 28:28 where he states the expectation that non-Jews will listen to his message.

functioned as a Spirit-anointed prophet to Israel so his followers continue his prophetic activities by performing signs and wonders and proclaiming his message to both Jews and non-Jews. The response to this prophetic message thus serves as the primary criterion for the inclusion or exclusion of non-Jews, as it also does for Jews.¹¹³

4.5.2 *Justin: The Prophets Predicted Your Unbelief*

Whereas Luke associates Jews who reject Jesus with past Jews who persecuted the prophets, and attributes the exclusion of both groups to their failure to heed God's prophets, Justin frequently draws a contrast between Jews and non-Jews, and applies ancient prophetic oracles of judgment to the Jewish nation as a whole.¹¹⁴ In the *Dialogue*, as we have seen, Justin outlines a contrast between the nations who believe in Jesus, on the one hand, and Jews and their proselytes, on the other. Within his development of this theme, Justin cites and interprets Isa 29:13 as a description of the Jewish people who, in his telling, do not understand, or accept, his exegetical explanation of the fulfillment of Isa 42:6–7 (cf. *Dial.* 121.4–122.5):

Πρὸς δὲ καὶ γελοῖον ἔσται ἡγεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς τῶν μὲν προσηλύτων ἀνεῶχθαι τὰ ὄμματα, ὑμῶν δὲ αὐτῶν οὐ, καὶ ὑμᾶς μὲν ἀκούειν τυφλοὺς καὶ κωφούς, ἐκείνους δὲ πεφωτισμένους. Καὶ ἔτι γελοιότερον ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν τὸ πρᾶγμα, εἰ τὸν <μὲν> νόμον τοῖς ἔθνεσι δεδόσθαι φήσετε, ὑμεῖς <δὲ> οὐτε ἐκείνους τὸν νόμον ἔγνωτε.... Τίς τυφλὸς ἀλλ' ἢ οἱ παῖδές μου, καὶ κωφὸς ἀλλ' ἢ οἱ κυριεύοντες αὐτῶν; Καὶ ἐτυφλώθησαν οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ. Εἶδετε πολλάκις, καὶ οὐκ ἐφυλάξασθε· ἀνεφγμένα τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσατε.... Οὐκ αἰσχύνεσθε πολλάκις ταῦτα ἀκούοντες, οὐδὲ ἀπειλοῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ φρίσσετε, ἀλλ' ἢ λαὸς μαρὸς καὶ σκληροκάρδιός ἐστε. Διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ προσθήσω τοῦ μεταθεῖναι τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον, λέγει κύριος, καὶ μεταθήσω αὐτούς, καὶ ἀπολῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν κρύψω. Εὐλόγως· οὐ γὰρ σοφοὶ ἐστε οὐδέ συνετοί, ἀλλὰ δριμεῖς καὶ πανοῦργοι· σοφοὶ εἰς τὸ κακοποιῆσαι μόνον, γῶναι δὲ βουλὴν θεοῦ κεκρυμμένην ἢ διαθήκην κυρίου πιστὴν ἢ τρίβους αἰωνίους εὐρεῖν ἀδύνατοι.

¹¹³ See the similar conclusion of Florian Wilk, "Apg 10,1–11,18 im Licht der lukanischen Erzählung vom Wirken Jesu," in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2002), 616–7: "On Menschen zu Jesus und damit zum endzeitlich gesammelten Gottesvolk gehören, entscheidet sich nicht an ihrer Herkunft, sondern am Hören, Bewahren und Tun des Wortes Gottes" (617).

¹¹⁴ E.g., *1 Apol.* 36.3–37.1; 49.1–5; *Dial.* 12.1–3; 24.3–4; 34.1–6; 78.10–11; 114.2–5; 122.1–123.4; 136.1–3; 140.1–2.

Besides, it would be absurd for you to suppose that the eyes of the proselytes are opened while your own are not; and that you should be called blind and deaf, but they, enlightened. And it would turn out to be a still more absurd matter for you if you state that the Law <on the one hand> had been given to the nations, <but on the other hand> you yourselves do not know that Law.... "Who is blind, but my servants? And deaf, but they who rule over them? And the servants of God are blind. You have often seen, but have not observed; your ears have been opened, and you have not heard" (Isa 42:19–20). ... Although you hear these things often, you are not ashamed, nor do you tremble when God threatens, but you are a foolish and stubborn people. "Because of this, behold, says the Lord, I will proceed to remove this people, and I will remove them, and I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will hide the understanding of the prudent" (Isa 29:14). And justly so. For you are neither wise nor understanding, but crafty and treacherous; wise only to do evil, but unable to know the hidden will of God, or the trustworthy covenant of the Lord, or to find the everlasting paths.
(*Dial.* 123.2–4)

Justin appeals to Isa 29:14, together with Isa 42:19–20, to provide scriptural validation for his conclusion that Jews are blind, obdurate, and unable to understand the Jewish scriptures. In his view, the entire Jewish nation becomes the object of such oracles of judgment because, in their lack of wisdom, they fail to recognize how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures. As a result, they experience the exclusion that Isa 29:14 foretells.

Similarly, in *Dial.* 78.10–11, Justin appeals to Isaiah 29:13–14 to show the legitimacy of his claim that Jews had failed to understand the scriptures correctly:

Ὡστε καλὸν ἂν εἴη ὑμᾶς, ὧ ἄνδρες, ἃ μὴ νενοήκατε, παρὰ τῶν λαβόντων χάριν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν μανθάνειν, ἀλλὰ μὴ κατὰ πάντα ἀγωνίζεσθαι τὰ ὑμέτερα διδάγματα κρατύνειν, ἀτιμάζοντας τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. Διὸ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς μετετέθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη, ὡς Ἡσαΐας φησὶν εἰπὼν οὕτως· Ἐγγίξει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος· τοῖς χεῖλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσί με, ἡ δὲ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· μάτην δὲ σέβονται με, ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδασκαλίας διδάσκοντες. Διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ προσθήσω τοῦ μεταθεῖναι τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον, καὶ μεταθήσω αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἀφελῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν αὐτῶν, τὴν δὲ σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν ἀθετήσω.

So it would be well for you, O men (i.e., Trypho and other Jews), to learn what you have not understood from us Christians, who have received grace from God, but not to strive in every way to strengthen your own doctrines while dishonoring those of God. Wherefore, even to us (i.e., to Justin and other non-Jewish Christ-believers), this grace has been

transferred,¹¹⁵ as Isaiah affirms when he says thus: “This people draws near to me, with their lips they honor me, but their heart is far from me. In vain do they worship me, teaching the commandments and doctrines of humans. Because of this, behold, I will proceed to remove this people, and I will remove them. And I will destroy the wisdom of their wise, and will reject the understanding of the prudent” (Isa 29:13–14).¹¹⁶ (*Dial.* 78.10–11)

Not only does Justin use Isa 29:13–14 to argue that scripture foretells the darkened condition of Jews; he also maintains that this passage explains why grace to understand the scriptures was transferred to Christ-believers. According to Justin, the false worship and teaching of Jews render them unfit to receive wisdom from God.¹¹⁷ Moreover, in this context, Justin plays on the term μετατίθημι to highlight the dire consequences of this reallocation of knowledge. Even as Justin argues that the scriptures predicted that grace to understand the scriptures would be transferred (μετετέθη) from Jews to non-Jewish Christ-believers, so he argues that the scriptures foretell the removal (τοῦ μεταθεῖναι, μεταθήσω) of Jews as the people of God. This unequivocal contrast between Jews and non-Jews thus leads to the application of Isa 29:13–14 to Jews as a whole and to a pronouncement of their exclusion.

In *Dial.* 27.3–4, Justin similarly argues that ancient prophecy describes their ongoing misunderstanding and susceptibility to sinfulness:

Καὶ πάντες γὰρ ἐξέκλιναν, βοᾷ, πάντες ἅμα ἠχρειώθησαν· οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνίων, οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἐνός. Ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολιούσαν, τάφος ἀνεωγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν, ἰδὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν· σύντριμμα καὶ τάλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν. Ὡστε ὃν τρόπον τὴν ἀρχὴν διὰ τὰς κακίας ὑμῶν ταῦτα ἐντέταλτο, ὁμοίως διὰ τὴν ἐν τούτοις ὑπομονὴν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐπίτασιν, διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν αὐτοῦ καὶ γινώσιν ὑμᾶς καλεῖ. Ὑμεῖς δὲ λαὸς σκληροκάριδος καὶ ἀσύνετος καὶ τυφλὸς καὶ κωφὸς καὶ νιοὶ οἷς οὐκ ἔστι πίστις ἐν αὐτοῖς, ὥς αὐτὸς λέγει, ἐστέ, τοῖς χεῖλεσιν αὐτὸν μόνον

¹¹⁵ Although Halton, *St. Justin*, 123, renders μετετέθη as “was given,” the verb μετατίθημι more typically denotes “transfer” or “remove”; see H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Reprint of the 9th ed. [1925–1940] with a new supplement edited by E. A. Barber and others; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 11–7.

¹¹⁶ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 57–8, notes that there are minor variants in the form of Isa 29:14 that Justin cites in *Dial.* 32.5, 78.11, and 123.4 and attributes these differences to the mistakes of careless copyists.

¹¹⁷ See also the citation of Isa 29:14 and near-parallel explanation in *Dial.* 32.5. In both *Dial.* 32.5 and 78.11, Justin contrasts the withdrawal of wisdom from Jews with the bestowal of “grace” and “wisdom” to understand upon Christ-believers (cf. *Dial.* 123.4).

τιμώντες, τῇ δὲ καρδίᾳ πόρρω αὐτοῦ ὄντες, ἰδίᾳ διδασκαλίας καὶ μὴ τὰ<ς> ἐκείνου διδάσκοντες.

And he cries out: "For all have turned away, all have together become worthless. There is none that understands, there is not even one. With their tongues they deceive, their throat is an open grave, the venom of asps is under their lips; destruction and misery are in their paths, and the way of peace they have not known." Thus, as your wickedness was the reason he (God) first commanded these things (i.e., the ritual requirements of the Law), likewise because of your steadfastness in these things, or rather greater inclination (to wickedness), through the same (precepts), he calls you to a remembrance and knowledge of him. But you (Jews) are a stubborn, stupid, blind, and lame people, children in whom there is no faith. As he himself says you are: "Honoring him only with lips, while your heart is far from him, teaching your own doctrines and not his" (Isa 29:13).

(*Dial.* 27.3–4)

In his first quotation of scriptural passages, Justin appears to use a set of citations, or allusions to scripture, that also occur in Rom 3:11–17. Despite his use of similar material, however, Justin interprets these texts in a different manner than Paul.¹¹⁸ Whereas Paul uses the catena to describe the sinful condition of all humanity, both Jews and non-Jews, Justin appeals to the same group of passages to describe the sinful state of Jews. He attempts to argue that God imposed the ritual requirements of the Mosaic law in order to curb their propensity toward idolatry (*Dial.* 27.1–3; cf. 18.2; 44.2; 45.3; 46.5, 7; 47.2; 67.4, 10), and reads Isa 29:13 as a description of the long-standing blindness and sinful condition of all Jews.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁸ Compare *Dial.* 27.3 with Rom 3:11–17 (cf. Eccl 7:20; Pss 5:9; 10:7; 14:2–3; 140:3; Isa 59:7–8).

¹¹⁹ For further discussion of Justin's argument that God imposed the ritual requirements of the Mosaic law upon Jews because they were prone to practicing idolatry and needed such rituals to prevent them from going astray, see Theodore Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law* (SBL 20; Missoula: Scholars, 1975), 62–76; Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 313–24. Compare also Acts 7:48–50 with *Dial.* 22.11. In these passages the Lukan Stephen and Justin both assert that God does not need a temple for a dwelling place. Although Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire, 135–425* (New York: OUP, 1986), 112, argues that Justin derives his punitive concept of the law from Acts 7, as Skarsaune notes, Luke does not depict the Mosaic precepts as a punishment or accommodation for the sin of Israel. To be sure, the speech of Stephen in Acts 7 denounces the infidelity and idolatry of Jews, but it nowhere indicates that the law was imposed as a punishment or accommodation for this condition. Rather, Stephen describes the Mosaic law as "living words" (Acts 7:38), indicates that it was "ordained by angels" (Acts 7:53), and accuses his opponents of infidelity toward the

Besides this, Justin treats past prophetic denunciations of ancient Israel as if they described, or directly addressed, Jews who lived at the time of Christ or later. For example, in *1 Apol.* 49.1, Justin asserts that Isaiah predicted that non-Jews would believe in Jesus and that Jews would fail to recognize him. Subsequently, he cites Isa 65:1–3 as a prophetic utterance that foretells the misunderstanding and obduracy of Jews who rejected Jesus (cf. *1 Apol.* 36.3–37.9).¹²⁰ Similarly, in *1 Apology* 63, Justin explains that the “prophetic Spirit,” through the words of the prophet Isaiah, reproaches present-day Jews because they do not recognize how the Jewish scriptures attest to the pre-existence of Christ (*1 Apol.* 63:1–3, 12–15; Isa 1:3), and in this context attributes their consequent persecution of Christ to the inspiration of demons (*1 Apol.* 63.10). Likewise, in *Dial.* 136.2–3, Justin indicates that God foreknew the ignorance and sinfulness of Jews who killed Christ and therefore predicted their future condition through the words of Isaiah (cf. *Dial.* 17.1–2 [Isa 3:9–11; 5:18–20]; 133.1–5 [Isa 3:9–15; 5:18–25]).¹²¹ Beyond simply evoking a Deuteronomistic pattern of sin-exile-return, then, Justin argues that the words of the ancient prophets describe the Jewish nation as a whole and predict the darkened condition of Jews who lived during his own era.¹²²

In the *Dialogue*, Justin justifies this approach to reading prophecy by arguing that the prophets sometimes spoke of events as if they had already happened even though these texts actually refer to the future (*Dial.* 114.1). In his discussion of examples, he includes the following: “And when he says through Isaiah . . . ‘I have stretched out my hands to a disobedient and contradicting people’ (Isa 65:2), and when he says, ‘Lord, who has believed our report’ (Isa 53:1), the words have been spoken as if to give an announcement of events that already happened”

law (Acts 7:53). These descriptions suggest that Luke wished to portray Stephen’s high regard for the Mosaic law.

¹²⁰ Note the full citation of *1 Apol.* 49.1–5 and further discussion of this passage above.

¹²¹ Similarly, in *Dial.* 16.4–5, Justin argues that God foreknew the violence of Jews against Christ and Christ-believers and thus spoke out against them through Isaiah (Isa 57:1–4).

¹²² Compare Luke 6:23, 26; 11:48; 13:31–35; Acts 7:51–53; Acts 28:25 where Luke likens the rejection of Christ by Jews to the actions of Jewish ancestors and to a long-standing pattern of rejection of the Jewish prophets. See, especially, the Lukan Stephen’s statement in Acts 7:51, “you are forever opposing the Holy Spirit, just as *your* ancestors,” and the Lukan Paul’s statement in Acts 28:25, “The Holy Spirit was right in saying to *your* ancestors through the prophet Isaiah.”

(*Dial.* 114.2).¹²³ Whereas Isaiah seems to address people who lived in his day, argues Justin, he actually describes the condition of Jews who reject Jesus. In this particular context, Justin explains how the teachers of Trypho fail to grasp the meaning of ancient prophecy and therefore misinterpret the Jewish scriptures (*Dial.* 114.3).¹²⁴ He then draws a contrast between the correct interpretation of Christ-believers and the misunderstanding of the scriptures by Jews (*Dial.* 114.4–5):

Ἀλλὰ ταῦτά μου οὐ νοεῖτε λέγοντος· ἃ γὰρ ποιῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν πεπροφήτευται οὐ νενοήκατε, οὐδὲ ἡμῖν προσάγουσιν ὑμᾶς τοῖς γεγραμμένοις πιστεύετε. Τερεμίας μὲν γὰρ οὕτω βοᾷ· Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι <ἐμὲ> ἐγκατελίπετε, πηγὴν ζῶσαν, καὶ ὠρύξατε ἑαυτοῖς λάκκους συντετριμμένους, οἱ οὐ δυνήσονται συνέχειν ὕδωρ.

But you do not understand when I say these things, for you have not understood what has been prophesied that Christ would do, nor do you believe us when we refer you to what has been written. For Jeremiah thus cries out: “Woe to you, because you have forsaken <me> the Living Fountain and have dug for yourselves broken cisterns that are not able to hold water” (Jer 2:13).

(*Dial.* 114.5)

Rather than arguing that some of his Jewish contemporaries were like past Jews who resisted the prophets, Justin asserts that both Isaiah and Jeremiah foresaw and predicted the darkened condition of the Jewish nation of his own day.¹²⁵ Again, at the end of the *Dialogue*, Justin appeals

¹²³ In *1 Apology* 42, Justin provides a similar explanation of why prophecy that is spoken in the past tense refers to future events.

¹²⁴ Justin charges the teachers of Trypho with failing to recognize references to the pre-existent Christ and the figurative meaning of the scriptures.

¹²⁵ Throughout the *Dialogue*, Justin uses similar reasoning to develop his portrait of the condition of Trypho’s teachers. He maintains that the Jewish teachers of Trypho lack the necessary knowledge and skill to interpret the scriptures correctly (*Dial.* 110.1–2; 112.2–4; 114.3; 134.2). For example, in *Dial.* 110.1–2, Justin indicates that, unlike Christ-believers, Jewish teachers miss the point of scriptural passages that foretell the first advent of Christ because they fail to understand that there are two advents of Christ, rather than one. He also indicates that the interpretations of the teachers of Trypho are faulty because they do not recognize the predictive, symbolic, or typological meaning of the Jewish scriptures. He argues that these teachers wrongly focus on base and insignificant details, or attempt to read the scriptures literally (*Dial.* 112.2–4; 114.3; 134.2). He also maintains that the teachers of Trypho extort and expunge parts of the Jewish scriptures in order to make them correspond to their opinions. For example, he attempts to explain in *Dial.* 43.4–7 that Isa 7:10–16 prophesied the virgin birth of Christ but argues in *Dial.* 43.8 that Trypho and his teachers have insisted that the real words of Isa 7:14 are not “behold a virgin (παρθένης) shall conceive” but “behold a young woman (νεάνις) shall conceive.” This unwarranted change, Justin argues, distorts the prophetic meaning of Isa 7:14 so that Jewish teachers incorrectly

to Jer 2:13 and Isa 29:13 in an attempt to provide scriptural support for his estimation of Trypho and his teachers:

πάντας ὁμοίως τοῖς ἐλευθέροις καὶ τέκνα συγκληρονόμα ἔξει· ὅπερ ἡμᾶς ὄντας συνιέναι ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε, διὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ζώσης πηγῆς πιεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῶν συντετριμμένων λάκκων καὶ ὕδωρ μὴ δυναμένων συνέχειν, ὡς ἡ γραφὴ λέγει. Εἰσὶ δὲ λάκκοι συντετριμμένοι καὶ ὕδωρ μὴ συνέχοντες, οὓς ὥρυξαν ὑμῖν οἱ διδάσκαλοι ὑμῶν, <αἱ διδασκαλῖαι> αὐτῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡ γραφὴ διαρρήδην λέγει, διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων.

He would have all children fellow-heirs together with the free though you (Jews) are not able to understand that we are, because you are unable to drink from the living fountain of God, but only from broken cisterns that are not able to retain water, as the scripture says (Jer 2:13). They are broken cisterns that do not retain water that your teachers have dug for you, their <doctrines>, as the scripture says expressly, “teaching as doctrines, the commandments of humans” (Isa 29:13). (*Dial.* 140.1–2)

According to Justin, the words of Jer 2:13 and Isa 29:13 describe the instruction given by these Jewish teachers.¹²⁶ Their words are like broken wells because they originate from human doctrines and therefore render their students unable to recognize the truth about God and Christ. Justin in this way appropriates the reproofs of ancient prophets as if they were descriptions of the ineptness and incomprehension of his Jewish contemporaries.¹²⁷

interpret it as a prediction about Hezekiah rather than a prophecy about Christ. In this context, as elsewhere, Justin presents the view that Trypho and his teachers believe that Isa 7:14 refers to Hezekiah. Similarly, in *Dial.* 83.1, Justin argues that the teachers of Trypho wrongly assume that LXX Ps 109:1–4 refers to Hezekiah. Moreover, in *Dial.* 62.2–4, Justin accuses Trypho and his teachers of interpreting a plural reference to God in Gen 1:26–28 as an instance of God talking to himself, or to the elements, rather than to another divine entity. Justin also charges the teachers of Trypho with denying the authenticity of the LXX (*Dial.* 68.7; 71.1; 120.5) and, in *1 Apol.* 31.2–5, appeals to the legend from the Letter of Aristeas to commend his scriptural citations. According to Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 26–46, however, the discrepancies between what Justin refers to as the “translation of the seventy” and the Greek translations that he attributes to Jews appear to be due to Justin’s reliance upon a Christian testimonia source rather than the LXX.

¹²⁶ Note the similar use of Isa 29:13 in Matt 15:9 and Mark 7:7.

¹²⁷ Similarly, in *Dial.* 38.2, Justin indicates that the teachers of Trypho “are convicted by the prophetic Spirit of being incapable of understanding the truths spoken by God” and in *Dial.* 48.2 he indicates that God testifies that Jews are only interested in the doctrines of their teachers, although he does not cite particular passages that affirm these assertions.

Some have argued that Luke draws a conclusion that is not unlike that of Justin: Jews as a whole have rejected the message and scriptural interpretation of Jesus and his followers whereas non-Jews have embraced their proclamation.¹²⁸ Certainly, in some instances, Luke does portray an *en masse* Jewish rejection in a manner similar to Justin. Nevertheless, whereas Luke evokes a Deuteronomistic perspective of the prophets to describe a long-standing division between faithful and unfaithful Jews, Justin applies prophetic oracles of judgment to all Jews and interprets such passages as statements that confirm the pre-determined destiny of the Jewish nation as a whole.

4.6 CONCLUSION

By presenting the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers as an eschatological gift that fulfills end-time prophecies, Luke and Justin provide scriptural justification for their claim that this group alone possesses an authoritative understanding of the Jewish scriptures. As the rightful recipients of these scriptural predictions, Christ-believers participate in the long-awaited end-time illumination and salvation that the Jewish scriptures predict. Conversely, according to both authors, the Jewish scriptures also provide warrant for the exclusion of those who do not understand, or reject, the message and exegesis of the Christ-believing community. These explanations of how insiders and outsiders experience the fulfillment of scriptural promises serve as a means of strengthening the identity of the Christ-believing community; insiders alone receive the promised gift of illumination whereas outsiders realize the fulfillment of oracles that predict darkening and exclusion. Furthermore, the common attempt of Luke and Justin to delineate the boundaries of the Christ-believing community in this way resembles the self-identifying strategies of some early Jewish groups who claimed that they were the rightful recipients of end-time revelation and that their opponents were objects of God's wrath.

Notwithstanding these similarities, Luke and Justin also distinguish between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community differently. Like some early Jewish interpreters, Luke uses a Deuteronomistic concept of prophecy to present Christ-believing Jews

¹²⁸ See, e.g., Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 326–7; Tyson, *Images of Judaism*, 174–8; Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 75–83.

as an elect group that embraces the message of God's appointed delegates over against the majority of Israel who reject this proclamation. Since Luke presents scriptural interpretation as a central part of their prophetic message, the exegesis of Jesus and his followers plays an important role in delineating a division between the elect and the unfaithful of Israel. Rather than radically changing this model to describe the mission to non-Jews, Luke continues to depict the positive reception of the message and scriptural interpretation of Jesus and his followers as a primary defining characteristic of community members, regardless of whether they are Jews or non-Jews.

Justin draws a sharper distinction between non-Jews and Jews than does Luke, and aligns his contrast between those who understand the Jewish scriptures and those who do not with a division between Jews and non-Jews, as if these two types of division were mutually complementary. Accordingly, he interprets past prophetic denunciations of Israel as descriptions that apply to the misunderstanding and obduracy of the entire Jewish nation—both past and present—or as predictions of the misunderstanding of contemporary Jews. In this way, he presents both the exclusion of the Jewish people and the acceptance of non-Jewish Christ-believers as the fulfillment of scriptural promises and as the realization of God's pre-determined plan.

CHAPTER FIVE

WHOSE PROMISES ARE THEY?

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In previous chapters, I explored the attempts of Luke and Justin to depict scriptural interpretation as a defining characteristic of the Christ-believing community: those who understood the scriptures, and the message of God, formed part of the true people of God whereas those who did not were excluded. Along the way, I noted that this self-defining strategy resembles that of certain early Jewish interpreters who also aimed to define their groups by describing their authoritative exegesis. For Luke and Justin, however, the widespread inclusion of non-Jews within the Christ-believing community introduced new challenges to this means of self-definition. Since the Christ-believing group disregarded some boundary markers that typically distinguished Jews from non-Jews, it had to mediate between its Jewish roots, on the one hand, and its new identity as a group distinct from Judaism, on the other.

This change in the terms of reference for the Christ-believing community meant that its relationship to the Jewish scriptures required further explanation. Although Luke and Justin both present Christ-believers as those who participate in the realization of scriptural promises through their correct understanding of the Jewish scriptures, it does not necessarily follow from this claim that the Christ-believing community—comprised of Jews and non-Jews—becomes heir to the scriptural promises that were originally made to the Jewish people. To argue that non-Jewish Christ-believers were the rightful recipients of promises addressed to Jews would involve an adjustment in their self-understanding in relation to Judaism.

In this chapter, I will evaluate the manner in which Luke and Justin each attempt to articulate the identity of the Christ-believing community by presenting Christ-believers as heirs of promises from the Jewish scriptures. To do so, I will compare and contrast their appropriation of three types of promise traditions: 1) their description of the fulfillment of Abrahamic promises; 2) their explanation of the fulfillment

of Isaianic promises; and 3) their presentation of the descent of the Spirit as the realization of scriptural promises. To be sure, an analysis of these three themes does not represent an exhaustive treatment of their representations of the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures. Nevertheless, it does provide a significant cross-section of data for evaluating their respective attempts to describe Christ-believers as the recipients of scriptural promises.

5.2 HISTORY OF SCHOLARSHIP

5.2.1 *Luke-Acts*

Scholars typically provide only brief discussions of Luke's presentation of Christ-believers as the recipients of scriptural promises, and often do so in the course of evaluating his description of Jews and non-Jews. Three representative positions of the treatment of this topic in Luke-Acts are as follows: (1) the non-Jewish church replaces Jews as the true people of God and as heirs to the scriptural promises originally made to Jews (e.g., Conzelmann; O'Neill); (2) Jewish Christ-believers represent restored Israel to whom non-Jewish Christ-believers are added as an associate people but both groups gain a share in scriptural promises (e.g., Jervell); (3) Jews tragically reject the salvation for Israel that God offers in Jesus and therefore experience exclusion from the scriptural heritage that was intended for them (Tannehill).

According to the first view, espoused by Hans Conzelmann, Luke portrays a progression in which the non-Jewish church becomes the replacement for Jews. He maintains that Luke initially emphasizes the fidelity of the primitive Jewish Christian community to Judaism in order to show the continuity between the epochs of *Heilsgeschichte*: the period of Israel, Jesus, and the church.¹ Within this framework,

¹ Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke* (trans. Geoffrey Buswell; Harper & Brothers: New York, 1960), 149–62. Although Conzelmann was responsible for the concept of the epochs of *Heilsgeschichte*, Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 96–102, follows Conzelmann's framework for describing salvation history. Like Conzelmann, he argues that Luke presents three distinct periods of history and links the church and Israel in order to show the continuity of the history of salvation rather than to create a bridge between Judaism and Christianity. See also E. Haenchen, "Judentum und Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte," *ZNW* 58 (1963): 155–87; cf. Stephen G. Wilson, *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts* (SNTSMS 23; Cambridge: CUP, 1973), 219–27.

Conzelmann argues that Luke attempts to demonstrate continuity between the promises of the Jewish scriptures and their fulfillment in Christ in order to forge a link between the past epoch of Israel and the present epoch of the church; the time of Jesus thus forms a bridge between these two stages. In his view, Jews fail to understand the exegesis of Christ-believers and therefore forfeit their scriptures (Acts 3:17; 13:27) whereas “the Church appears as the legitimate heir of Israel; Scripture belongs to the Church, for she is in possession of the correct interpretation.”² Although Conzelmann does not elaborate on this assertion, he appears to assume that Luke equates the acquisition of a correct understanding of the Jewish scriptures with becoming heir to these sacred texts and their promises.

A number of other scholars have more recently drawn similar conclusions regarding Luke’s depiction of non-Jewish Christ-believers as the recipients of scriptural promises. For example, Robert Maddox maintains that Luke presents Jews as excluded “from the fulfillment of their own ancestral promises” but portrays non-Jews as the recipients of these promises because they accepted their fulfillment through Christ. In other words, the Jewish rejection of Christ’s fulfillment of the scriptures did not invalidate these promises but led to their fulfillment for another group of people.³ Similarly, David Pao has argued that Luke uses the “Isaianic new exodus” theme to provide a re-definition of the people of God. He maintains that Luke presents Christ-believers as a new community who became “the legitimate heirs of the ancient Israelite traditions.” According to Pao, Luke re-defines the people of God as an entity distinct from Judaism and focuses upon portraying non-Jewish Christ-believers as the recipients of Isaianic promises.⁴

Jervell, whose position typifies the second view, maintains that Jewish Christ-believers are, for Luke, restored Israel to whom non-Jewish Christ-believers are added as an “associate” people.⁵ According to Jervell, Luke presents scriptural promises, which are fulfilled in Christ,

² Conzelmann, *Luke*, 162. Haenchen, *Acts*, 103–5, appears to concur, but does not elaborate upon Luke’s use of scripture to the extent that Conzelmann does.

³ Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982), 183.

⁴ David Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (WUNT 130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 77, 143.

⁵ J. Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 41–72. See also B. S. Easton, *Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts, and Other Papers* (ed. Frederick C. Grant; London: SPCK, 1955), 41–57, who argues that Luke presents the early church as a Jewish sect.

as the possession of Christ-believing Jews: “The author sketches a picture of Israel for whom the promises are fulfilled; he does not show us a new Israel arising out of the rejection of the old, but he speaks of the old Israel for whom the promises are fulfilled.”⁶ Within this argument, Jervell seems to affirm that non-Jews receive a part in the scriptural promises made to Jews:

Scripture has been fulfilled in that the promises made to the people of God were given to Gentiles. This has not occurred in such a way that they have been transferred from Jews to Gentiles but that they have come to the Gentiles through repentant Israel.⁷

Jervell does not develop this part of his argument, but he implies that the Christ-believing community, which is comprised of Jews and non-Jews, becomes heir to scriptural promises, even those made specifically to Jews.⁸ Therefore, although Jervell argues that the narrative of Luke-Acts provides an account of the fulfillment of scriptural promises for Jews, like Conzelmann, he appears to conclude that Christ-believers—both Jews and non-Jews—become recipients of the same scriptural promises.⁹

A third view, expressed by Robert Tannehill, maintains that Luke narrates a story of God’s comprehensive work of salvation for both

⁶ Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 51; idem, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 14–15, 61–75; idem, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 92–104, 170–1.

⁷ Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 64.

⁸ In his more recent commentary, *Apostelgeschichte*, 90–105, Jervell reasserts a similar position but does not provide further clarity regarding his view of how non-Jewish Christ-believers become heirs to the scriptural promises made to Jews: “Das Ergebnis ist die Restitution des Gottesvolkes, die nun die Voraussetzung für die Aufnahme von Heiden in das Gottesvolk ist, 1,6; 15,15ff. Das Heil von Nichtjuden, also Heiden, ist ein Teil der Verheissungen an Israel, Lk 2,29–32; Apg 2,39; 3,25; 13,47; 15,15ff. Die Kirche ist also das Gottesvolk in der Endzeit. Weil das Volk Israel durch das Kommen des Messias in sich gespalten wird, kommt es nicht zu einer Verwerfung des Volkes; denn das bussfertige Israel lebt in der Kirche weiter” (93). Therefore, it is difficult to know for certain if Jervell thinks that non-Jews who believe in Jesus become joint-heirs to the same promises that God made to Jews or if he concludes that they partake of scriptural promises that refer to the blessing of the nations (e.g., Isa 49:6; 42:6–7).

⁹ Like Jervell, John T. Carroll, *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts* (SBL Dissertation Series 92; Atlanta: Scholars, 1988), 158–64, suggests that Luke places non-Jewish Christ-believers alongside Jewish Christ-believers, rather than portraying the exclusion of Jews *en masse*. Nevertheless, he concludes that, as the composition of the Christ-believing community became increasingly non-Jewish, they continued to present themselves as heirs to the scriptures, heritage, and promises of Israel.

Israel and the nations, but concludes that this initiative of God repeatedly encounters Jewish resistance. This resistance tragically leads to the frustration of God's plan for Israel;¹⁰ imperceptiveness to God's message and purpose prevents Jews from receiving the scriptural promises intended for them.¹¹ Despite this outcome, in Tannehill's view, Luke demonstrates that a Jewish rejection of this fulfillment of scriptural promises does not change God's intentions for Israel:

Discussion of the Lukan attitude toward Israel must take account of two fundamental points: a persistent concern with the realization of scriptural promises that, the narrator recognizes, apply first of all to the Jewish people, and the stinging experience of rejection of the message that the hope of Israel is now being fulfilled.¹²

Although the contradiction between these two realities creates tension in the narrative, Tannehill argues, Luke does not attempt to resolve this difficulty. Instead, he continues to attest to the reality of God's faithfulness to offer the fulfillment of his promises to Jews even in the face of their rejection of this heritage.¹³

5.2.2 *Justin*

Scholars of Justin Martyr commonly agree that he portrays an antithetical relationship between Christ-believers and Jews, and depicts the former as the replacement for Israel and the rightful heirs of the scriptural promises originally made to Jews.¹⁴ For example, J. C. O'Neill argues that Justin describes a radical break between the Christ-believing community and Judaism, and maintains that this perspective of Justin parallels the portrait of separation between the non-Jewish church

¹⁰ Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986–1990), 1:15–44, 298–301; 2:344–57.

¹¹ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:348.

¹² Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:174–5, 352–3.

¹³ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:352; cf. idem, "Rejection by Jews and Turning to Gentiles: The Pattern of Paul's Mission in Acts," in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (ed. Joseph B. Tyson; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 83–101.

¹⁴ For discussion regarding this perspective in the writings of Justin, see Philippe Bobichon, *Justin Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon: Edition Critique, Traduction, Commentaire* (Paradosis 47/1; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2005), 73–104. Bobichon expresses the scholarly consensus in this way: "L'image des juifs est liée à celle des chrétiens par un rapport d'antithèse univoque et définitif: Justin oppose constamment les uns et les autres sur le plan intellectuel, moral et religieux, sans prendre en compte aucune particularité susceptible d'atténuer son propos" (90).

and Jews in Acts.¹⁵ Within this discussion, O'Neill asserts that "Acts represents a theology in which the church has abandoned the People and appropriated the Book,"¹⁶ and concludes that the significance of the Jewish scriptures for both Luke and Justin lies in the way that they "foretell Christ and provide lessons for the Church."¹⁷ According to O'Neill, the common claim of Luke and Justin that Christ-believers truly understand the Jewish scriptures leads both to conclude that this group alone represents true Israel and therefore receives the heritage of the chosen people of God.¹⁸

In contrast to O'Neill, Oskar Skarsaune argues that Justin goes further than his predecessors, including Luke, in arguing that Christ-believers are true Israel and heirs of the blessings originally promised to Jews. Skarsaune maintains that Justin relies on a combination of sources that hold opposing views regarding the ultimate fate of the Jewish people.¹⁹ In particular, he suggests that some sources present Jews who believe in Jesus as true Israel whereas other sources hold that the Jewish nation as a whole was rejected as God's chosen people. Although he notes that the writings of Luke and Justin exhibit "striking parallels," especially in their presentation of the origin and purpose

¹⁵ J. C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting* (London: SPCK, 1961), 12–3, 82–93.

¹⁶ O'Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 90. This position has been reasserted in the more recent work of Richard I. Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2006), 325–9, who sees close parallels between the negative sentiments expressed toward the Jews in Acts and certain second-century texts (e.g., *Barnabas* 6–10; 15–16): "Those who lack the eyes to see and the ears to hear... have effectively lost title to the claim to be the people of God and to the book of promises" (325). Similarly, Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 131, concludes that the author of Acts, like second-century proto-orthodox authors, asserts that contemporary Jews had rejected the gospel and therefore were no longer heirs of the promises of scripture.

¹⁷ O'Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 92. Although this conclusion seems close to that of Hans Conzelmann, Conzelmann (against O'Neill) rightly points out that Luke does not reduce "the issue between the church and Judaism to the existence of the common Book" (309). See Hans Conzelmann, "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity," in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (eds. Leander D. Keck and J. Louis Martyn; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), 298–309.

¹⁸ Unfortunately, O'Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 171, 175, does not give specific examples that illustrate this conclusion.

¹⁹ Oskar Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (NovTSup 106; Leiden: Brill, 1987), 326–52, 428.

of scriptural proof,²⁰ Skarsaune argues that Justin sharpens the motif of Jewish rejection in a manner that Luke and some of Justin's other sources do not. Accordingly, in his view, Justin presents non-Jewish Christ-believers as heirs to the identity and heritage of Jews in a more thoroughgoing manner than Luke.²¹

More recently, Denise Kimber Buell has also argued that Justin portrays Christ-believers as the replacement for Israel.²² Yet she maintains that Justin redefines what constitutes the people, or race, that is chosen by God.²³ In Kimber Buell's view, Justin presents membership within the Christ-believing community in a manner analogous to membership within a particular ethno-racial group even though belonging is attained through faith, obedience, and religious rites rather than through physical descent.²⁴ Within her discussion, Kimber Buell notes that Justin uses the Jewish scriptures to define this new people by arguing that, because they possess a privileged understanding of the Jewish scriptures, they have become heirs to the scriptural promises given to Israel.²⁵

In what follows, I will argue that both Luke and Justin indicate that Christ-believers become recipients of scriptural promises on the basis of their correct understanding of and obedience to the Jewish scriptures. Insofar as Luke and Justin use these criteria to describe the division between faithful and unfaithful Jews, their conclusions correlate with each other, and with those of early Jewish interpreters who assert

²⁰ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 256–9.

²¹ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 326–52. In this discussion, Skarsaune notes that P. Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church* (SNTSMS 10; Cambridge: CUP, 1969), 9–16, 165, argues that Justin is the first to claim that the church is “Israel.” Skarsaune himself suggests that “the only Christian writer prior to Justin who refers ‘Israel’ directly to the church as such is *1 Clement*. But even here, this is not his own language. ‘Israel’ occurs within OT quotations applied to Christians” (329; see *1 Clem.* 29:2 where Deut 32:8–9 is applied to the church).

²² Denise Kimber Buell, *Why This New Race: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 98–9, notes that Justin portrays Christ-believers as true and spiritual Israel and the race of Judah, Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham (*Dial.* 11.5; 123.8; 125.5; 135.3), as a high priestly race (*Dial.* 116.3), as another people (*Dial.* 119.3; 123.1; 124.1; 134.4), and as another Israel (*Dial.* 123.6; 130.3; 135.5–6).

²³ Kimber Buell, *New Race*, 102.

²⁴ For example, Kimber Buell, *New Race*, 101–3, notes that in *Dial.* 138.2–3, Justin describes Christ as the progenitor of a “new race” that is founded on baptism, faith, and the cross. Similarly, she points out that Justin describes Christ-believers as a new people who came into existence after the death of Christ: “we sprouted up afresh as another people” (*Dial.* 119.3; cf. *Dial.* 123.8; 135.5–6).

²⁵ Kimber Buell, *New Race*, 103–8.

that only those Jews who understand and live faithfully according to the scriptures become beneficiaries of the promises therein (e.g., CD 1–3; 1QS 3–4; 5; 8; 1 En. 90:6–38; 93:8–9).²⁶ Nevertheless, because Luke and Justin also need to account for the inclusion of non-Jews within the Christ-believing community,²⁷ they must explain how this group could also benefit from the promises of scripture. On this latter point, their different explanations of how and why non-Jews become recipients of scriptural promises have significant ramifications for their respective descriptions of the Christ-believing community. I will argue that although Justin portrays all Christ-believers—both Jews and non-Jews—as recipients of the promises that God originally made to Israel, Luke depicts only Christ-believing Jews as heirs to these promises. Notably, this position differs from that of Conzelmann who maintains that Luke presents the non-Jewish church as heir to the scriptures and heritage of Jews. Yet it also differs from the conclusion of Jervell who appears to maintain that Luke portrays non-Jews as co-partakers with Jews in the scriptural promises that were originally made to the Jewish people.

5.3 ABRAHAMIC PROMISES

5.3.1 *Abrahamic Promises in Luke-Acts*

Luke presents Jews who believe in Jesus as the recipients of the promises made to the offspring of Abraham. For him, the repentance and obedience of such Jews qualifies them to become heirs to Abrahamic promises. When Luke refers to non-Jews who participate in the fulfillment of Abrahamic promises, however, he does not indicate that they also receive the promises that God intended for the seed of Abraham. Rather, they partake of the part of the promise to Abraham in which God declares that “all the families of the earth” would receive blessing through his seed.

²⁶ See also the discussion of these passages in Chapter One.

²⁷ 1 En. 90:30–41 also describes the inclusion of non-Jews in its depiction of the descent of the eschatological temple and return to a primordial era but the inclusion of non-Jews is a more central theme in the writings of Luke and Justin.

5.3.1.1 *Qualifications for the Descendants of Abraham*

In the opening chapters of his gospel, Luke has leading figures express the expectation that God would help the Jewish people by fulfilling the promises that he made to Abraham. In the Magnificat (Luke 1:54–55) and the Benedictus (Luke 1:69–75), Mary and Zechariah exclaim that, in fidelity to Abraham, God would rescue his people by sending a mighty Davidic leader to save them. Nevertheless, Luke soon qualifies these glowing expectations with the admonitions of John the Baptist. In Luke 3:7–9, John warns the crowds that their status as physical descendants of Abraham would not secure their position as the recipients of the blessings associated with this heritage:

Ἔλεγεν οὖν τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ὄχλοις βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ, Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς; ποιήσατε οὖν καρποὺς ἀξίους τῆς μετανοίας καὶ μὴ ἄρξησθε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, Πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι δύναται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἐγεῖραι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβραάμ. ἤδη δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ρίζαν τῶν δένδρων κεῖται· πᾶν οὖν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.

Then he (John) said to the crowds that came out to be baptized by him, “You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Therefore, produce fruits worthy of repentance and do not begin to say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham as our ancestor’; for I tell you that God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham. Even now the ax is lying at the root of the trees; every tree therefore that does not produce good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire.”

(Luke 3:7–9)

By having John address the crowds (οἱ ὄχλοι) with this warning, rather than only the Sadducees and Pharisees (compare Matt 3:7–10), Luke calls the efficacy of the Abrahamic descent of the Jewish people as a whole into question.²⁸ Although God sent Jesus because of his mercy

²⁸ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (AB 28, 28A; 2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1981–1985), 1:467, argues that Luke wishes to emphasize that John the Baptist addressed a broad audience. By contrast, Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (2 vols.; BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994–1996), 1:303, maintains that the Jewish leaders were the primary target for Luke, even though he refers to the crowds more generally. From yet a different perspective, François Bovon, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50* (Hermeneia; trans. Christine M. Thomas; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 122, argues that Luke here presents the οἱ ὄχλοι as a group that does not bear fruit worthy of repentance because, by Luke’s time, non-Jews outnumbered Jews in the Christ-believing community; cf. Gerhard Schneider, *Lukas, Theologe der Heilsgeschichte: Aufsätze zum lukanischen Doppelwerk* (2 vols.; Königstein/Ts.-Bonn:

toward the fathers and in remembrance of the promises that he made to Abraham (Luke 1:72–73), only those Jews who repent become eligible to receive the benefits of these promises.

The further declaration of John that God could raise up children for Abraham from “these stones” to replace unrepentant Jews (Luke 3:8b)²⁹ leads some commentators to suggest that Luke wishes to depict future non-Jewish Christ-believers as the children of Abraham. The description of new stones might serve as a proleptic reference to the inclusion of the nations; by looking forward to the acceptance of non-Jews by God, the statement could appeal to a non-Jewish readership of Luke-Acts.³⁰ Alternatively, it is possible that the description of new stones could simply mean that God was able to change stones into additional physical descendants of Abraham. Furthermore, the subsequent portrayal of the response of the crowds in Luke 3:10–14 suggests that Luke still has the Jewish people primarily in view in this context. At first, Luke implies that the crowds were overconfident of their status as the children of Abraham: “Do not begin to say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham as our father’” (Luke 3:8). Yet after the warnings of John, and his command to produce (ποιήσατε) fruit worthy of repentance, the same crowds express a different attitude by repeatedly asking, “What then should we produce (ποιήσωμεν)?” (Luke 3:10, 12, 14).³¹ This latter reference to the crowds in Luke 3:10–14 suggests that these Jews wish to heed John’s warning to produce (ποιέω) fruit worthy of repentance. If so, their positive response to his message secures their

P. Hanstein, 1985), 1:85; Alfred Plummer, *The Gospel According to S. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1896), 88.

²⁹ John Nolland, *Luke* (WBC 35; 3 vols.; Dallas: Word Books, 1989–1993), 1:147, argues that the reference to raising up stones may be a wordplay on the Aramaic term for “stones” (אבנים) since it resembles the Aramaic word for “sons” (בנים). J. Jeremias, “λίθος,” in *Theological Dictionary of New Testament Words* (10 vols.; trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; eds. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1975), 4:268, 269–71, suggests instead that the image of raising up from stones alludes to Isa 51:1–2, a passage that describes Abraham as a rock from which those who seek God are cut. So also Bovon, *Luke*, 123; Bock, *Luke*, 1:305; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:468.

³⁰ See, e.g., Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (2 vols.; HTKZNT; Freiburg: Herder, 1982–1994), 1:165; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 141; Bock, *Luke*, 1:306.

³¹ Luke’s repeated use of ποιέω in this context appears to play on its double-meaning (“to do” and “to produce”) to create a connection between the metaphor of producing fruit and the action needed for repentance. By repeating the term, Luke demonstrates how the crowd takes seriously the command to repent and the warning that the tree that does not produce fruit will be cut off and cast into the fire.

position as true children of Abraham and their status as the recipients of the benefits promised to his descendants.

A similar emphasis upon repentance emerges in Luke 13:22–30, where Luke has Jesus portray the exclusion of some Jews from future blessings associated with the figure of Abraham. The Lukan Jesus prefaces his description of the eschatological banquet with a warning about the necessity of striving to enter “the narrow door” that leads to salvation (Luke 13:22–24).³² Subsequently, Jesus describes the circumstances of those who will not gain access to the future banquet:

ἀφ’ οὗ ἂν ἐγερθῇ ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης καὶ ἀποκλείσῃ τὴν θύραν καὶ ἄρξῃσθε ἔξω ἐστάναι καὶ κρούειν τὴν θύραν λέγοντες, Κύριε, ἀνοιξον ἡμῖν, καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἐρεῖ ὑμῖν, Οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ. τότε ἄρξεσθε λέγειν, Ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίομεν καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας· καὶ ἐρεῖ λέγων ὑμῖν, Οὐκ οἶδα [ὑμᾶς] πόθεν ἐστέ· ἀπόστητε ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ πάντες ἐργάται ἀδικίας. ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὁδόντων, ὅταν ὀψῇσθε Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαάκ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ πάντα τοὺς προφῆτας ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὑμᾶς δὲ ἐκβαλλομένους ἔξω. καὶ ἔξουσιν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ καὶ νότου καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰσὶν ἔσχατοι οἱ ἔσονται πρῶτοι καὶ εἰσὶν πρῶτοι οἱ ἔσονται ἔσχατοι.

When once the owner of the house has got up and shut the door, and you begin to stand outside and to knock at the door, saying, “Lord, open to us,” then he will answer and say to you, “I do not know where you come from.” Then you will begin to say, “We ate and drank in your presence, and you taught in our streets.” But he will say, “I tell you, I do not know where you come from; depart from me, all you evildoers!” There will be weeping and gnashing of teeth there when you see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, but you yourselves thrown out. And they will come from east and west, and from north and south, and will recline at table in the kingdom of God. And, behold, some are last who will be first, and some are first who will be last.

(Luke 13:25–30)

Whereas the parallel account in Matthew clearly presages the future inclusion of non-Jews by setting the description of the eschatological

³² The description of the narrow door serves as a response to the question “Lord, will only a few be saved?” (Luke 13:23) and occurs in the context of Jesus’ declaration that only Jews who repent would escape the coming judgment (Luke 13:1–9). Since in antiquity the description of the narrow way represented the way of righteousness, the image of a narrow door in this passage probably highlights the need to strive to act in a righteous manner as part of choosing the path of repentance. Compare, for example, 1 Enoch 92–105; 1QS 3–4; *T. Ash.* 1:3–6:3; Matt 7:13–14.

feast in a context where Jesus marvels at the faith of a non-Jew,³³ the Lukan version focuses upon the agonized response of unfaithful Jews who are excluded from the feast. Although Luke envisages a group of pilgrims who will gather from the four corners of the earth for the feast, he does not clearly indicate whether these people are Diaspora Jews or non-Jews.³⁴ The absence of a clear description of the identity of the group suggests that depicting the inclusion of non-Jews was not the foremost concern for Luke in this context. By having Jesus refer to those who cannot enter the banquet as “evildoers” (Luke 13:27), Luke further attributes the exclusion of such Jews to their immoral, or unrepentant condition.³⁵ These elements of the account, together with Luke’s emphasis upon the need to enter the kingdom through “the narrow door” (Luke 13:24), reinforce the warning of John the Baptist that not all Jews will qualify to receive the benefits of their physical lineage.

Again, in the speech of Stephen, Luke indicates that Jews who commit idolatry and refuse to listen to the messengers of God forfeit their Abrahamic inheritance.³⁶ Luke has Stephen open his speech with the

³³ Nolland, *Luke*, 2:735, suggests that Matthew applies the text to the gathering of non-Jews but that Luke uses it to describe the re-gathering of Israel; cf. Plummer, *Luke*, 347; Marshall, *Luke*, 563.

³⁴ Scholars hold differing views regarding the identity of the pilgrims. Dale C. Allison, “Who Will Come from East and West? Observations on Matt. 8:11–12–Luke 13:28–29,” *IBS* 11 (1989): 160, argues that Luke adds “north and south” (Luke 13:29) to Matthew’s “east and west” (Matt 8:11) in order to allude to Ps 107:3, a text that portrays the return of Jewish exiles to their land. Accordingly, he suggests that Luke 13:28–29 refers to the inclusion of Diaspora Jews rather than non-Jews; cf. Nolland, *Luke*, 2:735. By contrast, Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 528–9, reads Luke 13:28–30 against the context of the eschatological banquet scene portrayed in Isa 25:6–9, a passage that depicts the inclusion of non-Jews. Green therefore concludes that Luke portrays the replacement of Jews with non-Jews in this context; cf. Bock, *Luke*, 2:1239; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1023.

³⁵ Notably, descriptions of the immoral or evil condition of those excluded from the feast do not occur in Matt 8:5–13.

³⁶ Although scholars often attempt to determine the extent to which the speech in Acts 7 represents the views of Stephen, Luke, or traditional material, the present form of the address fits with the literary account of Luke-Acts. As such, the Stephen speech contributes to our understanding of the Lukan representation of Abrahamic promises and their fulfillment. For further discussion, see W. G. Kümmel, *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of Its Problems* (trans. S. McLean and Howard C. Kee; Nashville: Abingdon, 1972), 127–30; Earl Richard, *Acts 6.1–8.4: The Author’s Method of Composition* (SBLDS 41; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 22–31. Some, such as M. Simon, “Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple,” *JEH* 2 (1951): 139–40, argue that the speech goes back to the historical Stephen. Others regard the speech as a Lukan creation. See, e.g., H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristen-*

story of the calling of Abraham (Acts 7:2–4).³⁷ In this account, Stephen emphasizes that Abraham had no child and did not possess the land of Canaan even though God promised to give him these things (Acts 7:5). Moreover, in Acts 7:6–7, the description and adaptation of Gen 15:13–14 revises the content and goal of the promises that God gave to Abraham:

ἐλάλησεν δὲ οὕτως ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ πάροιθεν ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτὸ καὶ κακώσουσιν ἔτη τετρακόσια· καὶ τὸ ἔθνος ᾧ ἐὰν δουλεύουσιν κρινῶ ἐγώ, ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξελεύσονται καὶ λατρεύουσίν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ.

And God spoke to this effect, that his offspring would be resident aliens in a foreign land, who would enslave and mistreat them for four hundred years. “But I will judge the nation that they serve,” said God, “and after these things they shall come out and worship me in this place.” (Acts 7:6–7)

The citation of Gen 15:13–14 in Acts 6:6–7 changes the phrase “and afterward they shall come out with great possessions,” from Gen 15:14b, to “and after these things they shall come out and worship me in this place.” The latter phrase appears to be an excerpt from Ex 3:12—“you shall worship God on this mountain”—but contains a further adaptation in which “this mountain” becomes “this place.”³⁸ The combination of scriptural texts thus links the promise that Abraham’s

tums (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1949), 441; J. Bihler, “Der Stephanusbericht (Apg 6,8–15 un 7,54–8,2),” *BZ* 3 (1959): 252–70. Still others maintain that the speech represents a combination of traditional and Lukan material. See, e.g., Martin Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (London, SCM, 1951), 167–70; U. Wilckens, *Die Missionreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditionsgegeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Neukirchener: Verlag, 1974), 208–21; Haenchen, *Acts*, 286–9.

³⁷ Although Gen 11:31–12:3 indicates that God called Abraham from Haran, Stephen indicates that God called Abraham when he was still living in Chaldea. Note, however, that Gen 15:7 and Neh 9:7 both indicate that God brought Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldeans.

³⁸ Some scholars argue that “this place” in Acts 6:7 refers to the Jerusalem temple since Acts 6:13–14 describes accusations that Stephen allegedly made against “this place” (i.e., the temple). See, e.g., John J. Kilgallen, *The Stephen Speech: A Literary and Redactional Study of Acts 7:2–53* (AB 67; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976), 33–5; C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–1998), 1:345. Others suggest that the phrase refers more generally to the promised land. See, e.g., Nils Dahl, “The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts,” in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, 145; F. F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 194; Haenchen, *Acts*, 179. This latter position fits better with the immediate context of Acts 7:6–7 since Stephen reports the words of God to Abraham while he is in Canaan, i.e., in “this place.”

descendants would inherit the land with their worship, or service, of God in the land.³⁹ By arranging the citation in this way, Luke has Stephen present worship in the land as the ultimate realization of Abrahamic promises.⁴⁰

This interpretation of Gen 15:13–14 in Acts 7:6–7 enables Luke to demonstrate how the refusal to listen to Moses and the subsequent idolatry of the children of Israel frustrated the fulfillment of Abrahamic promises. In Acts 7:17, Luke has Stephen introduce the story of the deliverance from Egypt through Moses by indicating that God intended to fulfill the promise he made to Abraham through this event: “But as the time drew near for the fulfillment of the promise that God had made to Abraham, our people in Egypt increased and multiplied” (Acts 7:17).⁴¹ According to Stephen, however, this era of fulfillment was not realized because, after they were delivered, the people fell into false worship:

ὧ οὐκ ἠθέλησαν ὑπήκοοι γενέσθαι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ ἀπόσαντο καὶ ἐστράφησαν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν εἰς Αἴγυπτον εἰπόντες τῷ Ἀαρὼν, Ποίησον ἡμῖν θεοὺς οἱ προπορεύσονται ἡμῶν· ὁ γὰρ Μωϋσῆς οὗτος, ὃς ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, οὐκ οἶδαμεν τί ἐγένετο αὐτῷ. καὶ ἐμοσχοποίησαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις καὶ ἀνήγαγον θυσίαν τῷ εἰδώλῳ καὶ εὐφραίνοντο ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν. ἔστρεψεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς λατρεῖν τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν, Μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηνέγκατέ μοι ἔτη τεσσεράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ; καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μόλοχ καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ [ὑμῶν] Ῥαιφάν, τοὺς τύπους οὓς ἐποιήσατε προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς, καὶ μετοικίω ὑμᾶς ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλῶνος.

Our ancestors were unwilling to be obedient to him; instead, they pushed him aside, and in their hearts they turned back to Egypt, saying

³⁹ Note that Luke 1:72–75 also associates the fulfillment of the promises made to Abraham with a deliverance that would enable his descendants to worship, or serve, God without fear. In both Luke 1:74 and Acts 7:7, Luke associates λατρεύω, a term typically used to describe the worship of a deity (e.g., Ex 7:16, 26; Num 16:9; Deut 8:19; 12:2; 13:3; Josh 22:27; 23:7; 24:14; Ezek 20:32; 2 Chron 7:19), with the fulfillment of the promises made to Abraham. Luke also uses the term to describe the activities of Christ-believers or those waiting for the arrival of Christ (e.g., Luke 2:37; Acts 24:14; 26:7; 27:23).

⁴⁰ Robert L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* (SBL 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 118–32.

⁴¹ S. van den Eynde, “Children of the Promise: On the διαθήκη-promise to Abraham in Luke 1,72 and Acts 3,25” in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1999), 475–6, argues that Luke adapts promises to Abraham and creates a line of promise and fulfillment from Abraham to the time of Moses and the exodus.

to Aaron, "Make gods for us who will go before us; for this Moses who led us out from the land of Egypt, we do not know what has happened to him." In those days they made a calf, offered up a sacrifice to the idol, and rejoiced in the works of their hands. But God turned away and handed them over to worship the host of heaven, as it is written in the book of the prophets: "Did you offer to me slain victims and sacrifices forty years in the wilderness, O house of Israel? You took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of [your] god Rephan, the images that you made to worship; so I will remove you beyond Babylon." (Acts 7:39–43)

Rather than securing the fulfillment of the Abrahamic promise by worshipping God in the land (Acts 7:6–7; cf. Gen 15:13–14), the children of Israel resisted Moses and fell into perverted worship. As a result of their idolatry, God turned away from them and "handed them over to worship the host of heaven" (Acts 7:42). Stephen then attributes the Babylonian exile to the false worship of Israel (Acts 7:43), a conclusion that further links their idolatry with a failure to receive the promise that the offspring of Abraham would inherit the land.⁴² According to the speech of Stephen, then, disobedience and idolatry prevent the children of Israel from receiving the promises made to Abraham and his descendants.⁴³

As noted in Chapter Four, Luke has Stephen describe Abraham as "our ancestor" (Acts 7:2), and other patriarchs and ancient Israelite leaders as "our ancestors" (Acts 7:11, 12, 15, 19, 38, 39, 44, 45 [2x]) to express his solidarity with other Jews; all were physical descendants of Abraham and potential recipients of Abrahamic promises.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, by changing "our ancestors" to "your ancestors" in Acts 7:51–53, Stephen identifies his audience, but not himself or his group, with a

⁴² Although the next section of the speech (Acts 7:44–50) does not explicitly link the worship of God to promises made to Abraham, Dahl, "Story of Abraham," 74–5, argues that the account of David's request to build a dwelling place for God (Acts 7:46) should be interpreted as a request for the fulfillment of God's promise to Abraham. G. Stanton, "Stephen in Lucan Perspective," in *Studia Biblica III Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors. Sixth International Congress on Biblical Studies. Oxford, 3–7 April 1978* (JSNTSup 3; ed., E. A. Livingstone; Sheffield: JSOT, 1981), 355, suggests that Acts 7:44–50 provides another example of how Israel failed to worship God and therefore failed to become recipients of the promises made to Abraham.

⁴³ Stanton, "Stephen," 351–2; cf. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:89–90.

⁴⁴ Luke also has other characters in the narrative refer to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and their descendants as "our ancestors" (Luke 1:55, 72; Acts 3:13; 5:30; 13:17; 22:14; 26:6), and has Stephen use "our fathers" to refer to the patriarchs (Acts 7:11, 12, 15, 32), to the exodus generation (Acts 7:19, 38, 39, 44), or to Israelites of a later period (Acts 7:45).

particular segment of the physical descendants of Abraham: namely, those idolatrous Jews who resisted Moses. Even as their forefathers committed idolatry, resisted Moses, and killed the prophets, so the opponents of the Christ-believing community follow in their footsteps by rejecting and killing Jesus, the “Righteous One” (Acts 7:52). The accusation implies that these opponents, like their ancestors, “disinherit themselves from God’s promises to the offspring of Abraham.”⁴⁵ By having Stephen also describe this group as “uncircumcised in heart and ears” (Acts 7:51), Luke implies that, although they were circumcised in the physical sense, they stood outside the covenant of circumcision given to Abraham (Acts 7:8). The speech of Stephen thus distinguishes between different types of physical descendants of Abraham and concludes that Jews who do not obey the prophets, Moses, and Jesus, do not qualify to become recipients of the Abrahamic promises.⁴⁶

5.3.1.2 *The Descendants of Abraham and the Inclusion of Non-Jews*

Luke describes how non-Jews would participate in the blessings promised to Abraham in only one passage:

ὁμοῖς ἐστε οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῆς διαθήκης ἧς διέθετο ὁ θεὸς πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν λέγων πρὸς Ἀβραάμ, Καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου [ἐν]ευλογηθήσονται πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς. ὑμῖν πρῶτον ἀναστήσας ὁ θεὸς τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εὐλογοῦντα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν ἕκαστον ἀπὸ τῶν πονηριῶν ὑμῶν.

You are the descendants of the prophets and of the covenant that God made with your ancestors, saying to Abraham, “And in your offspring all the families of the earth shall be blessed” (Gen 12:3; 22:18). For you first God raised up his servant and sent him to bless you by turning each one from your wicked ways.
(Acts 3:25–26)

⁴⁵ Dahl, “Story of Abraham,” 77.

⁴⁶ Some commentators regard the speech of Stephen as an attack against Judaism that paves the way for the mission to non-Jews and the separation of Christianity from Judaism. See, e.g., I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 132; Haenchen, *Acts*, 287–9; A. F. Loisy, *Les Actes des apôtres* (Paris: Emile Nourry, 1920), 318–20; O’Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 75–9; Dibelius, *Studies*, 168–9; Tyson, *Marcion*, 57. Some also regard the speech as a reflection of the sentiments of the non-Jewish Christ-believing community that identified with Stephen and saw itself as the heirs of the promises made to Abraham, rather than Jews. The speech itself, however, distinguishes between differing types of physical descendants of Abraham, rather than between Jews and non-Jews. Although it may have been redacted or composed much later, the passage recounts an inner-Jewish struggle and presents Jewish Christ-believers as the recipients of the fulfillment of Abrahamic promises.

The reference to “all the families of the earth” in Acts 3:25 suggests that Luke here wishes to indicate that God would fulfill his promises to Abraham by bringing blessing to non-Jews.⁴⁷ What remains less than certain, however, is the referent of τῷ σπέρματί σου, the offspring through whom this blessing would come.

In Acts 3:26, we read that God raised up Jesus to bless Jews by turning them from their wicked ways. By having Peter state in Acts 3:26 that Jesus would bless (εὐλογοῦντα) the Jewish people, Luke creates a link between this action of Jesus and the promise to Abraham that all peoples would be blessed ([ἐν]εὐλογηθήσονται) “in your descendants” (ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου).⁴⁸ This may suggest that Luke wishes to portray Jesus as the chosen seed (σπέρμα), or offspring, through whom the Abrahamic promises would be fulfilled for both Jews and non-Jews.⁴⁹ Alternatively, since in Acts 3:25a the Lukan Peter refers to his Jewish audience as the “descendants (οἱ υἱοί)...of the covenant that God made...to Abraham,” it is possible that the phrase τῷ σπέρματί σου in Acts 3:25b refers to Jews who repent and believe in Jesus. As the offspring of Abraham, they become a blessing to all peoples (Gen 22:18; cf. Gen 12:3; 26:4). Furthermore, the statement in Acts 3:26 that God sent Jesus to Jews first suggests that, even though Jesus initially fulfils the promises made regarding the offspring of Abraham, Jews who believe in Jesus also have a special role as participants in the

⁴⁷ Although scholars provide differing interpretations of Luke’s understanding of the role of Jews in the fulfillment of Abrahamic promises in Acts 3:25–26, there is wide agreement that Acts 3:25b foreshadows the inclusion of non-Jews. See, e.g., Wilckens, *Die Missionreden*, 43; Nils A. Dahl, “A People for His Name,” *NTS* 4 (1957–58): 327; Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 58–61; Wilson, *Gentile Mission*, 219–22; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 291.

⁴⁸ The source of the citation in Acts 3:25b is not entirely clear. The reference to the seed of Abraham (τῷ σπέρματί σου) occurs in LXX Gen 22:18 (ἐνεὐλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς) whereas LXX Gen 12:3 refers to Abraham but not his seed (ἐνεὐλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς). The word order of the citation, however, seems to follow LXX Gen 12:3 more closely. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:212, regards the citation in Acts 3:25b as a conflation of LXX Gen 12:3 and 22:18; cf. Bruce, *Acts*, 146. Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP 5; Collegeville, Liturgical Press, 1992), 70, suggests that the citation in Acts 3:25b is most similar to LXX Gen 22:18 but notes that it also resembles LXX Gen 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; 26:4. Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (JSNTSup 12; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 195–6, suggests that Acts 3:25 relies on LXX Gen 22:18 because of the similarity in wording.

⁴⁹ Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 30, argues that “seed” in Acts 3:25b does not refer to a collective but only to Christ; cf. Haenchen, *Acts*, 209; Bock, *Proclamation*, 196–7; Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (SNT 1; Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1969), 74–5.

Abrahamic promises. As Fitzmyer observes, “the blessing...was to come to and through Abraham’s offspring...and then through them to all others.”⁵⁰

In Acts 3:26, Luke clearly explains that God sent Jesus to bless Israel, an assertion that identifies him with the offspring of Abraham and the fulfillment of Abrahamic promises. Since Luke portrays both Jesus and repentant Jews as descendants of Abraham in this context, however, it seems that he does not wish to restrict τῷ σπέρματί σου to only one referent but to indicate that both Jesus and repentant Jews have a part in receiving and participating in the promises made to Abraham regarding his descendants.⁵¹ Within this explanation, moreover, non-Jews do not become recipients of the blessings promised for the descendants of Abraham. Rather, they receive the blessing that Christ and Christ-believing Jews mediate to all peoples in their role as the offspring of Abraham (Gen 12:3; 22:18).⁵²

5.3.2 *Abrahamic Promises in the Writings of Justin*

Like Luke, Justin warns that the status of Jews as physical descendants of Abraham does not guarantee that they will become recipients of Abrahamic promises. In some cases, he describes a division between faithful and unfaithful Jews in a manner that parallels the thought of Luke. Yet, unlike Luke, Justin frequently draws a contrast between Jews and non-Jewish Christ-believers when describing the recipients of Abrahamic promises, and presents the latter as the true children of Abraham.

5.3.2.1 *Qualifications for the Descendants of Abraham*

In Dial. 44.1, Justin cautions Trypho not to rely on his Abrahamic pedigree:

⁵⁰ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 292. Similarly, Dennis Hamm, “Acts 3:12–26: Peter’s Speech and the Healing of the Man Born lame,” *PRS* 11 (1984): 214, argues that Abrahamic promises are fulfilled first for Jews, who prove to be the true people of God by accepting the messiah, and then to non-Jews. See also Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 58–60.

⁵¹ Jeffrey S. Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews: Abraham in Early Christian Controversy* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), 119–20, also suggests this view.

⁵² Tannehill, “Paul’s Mission,” 87–8, argues that this passage shows that the narrator still regards the scriptural promises as promises for the Jewish people.

Καὶ <ἔτι> ἑξαπατᾶτε ἑαυτοὺς ὑπονοοῦντες διὰ τὸ εἶναι τοῦ Ἀβραάμ κατὰ σάρκα σπέρμα πάντως κληρονομήσειν τὰ κατηγγελμένα παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ δοθήσεσθαι ἀγαθὰ. Οὐδεὶς γὰρ οὐδὲ<ν> ἐκείνων οὐδαμῶθεν λαβεῖν ἔχει πλὴν οἱ τῇ γνώμῃ ἐξομοιωθέντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ Ἀβραάμ καὶ ἐπιγνόντες τὰ μυστήρια πάντα, λέγω δὲ ὅτι τὶς μὲν ἐντολὴ εἰς θεοσέβειαν καὶ δικαιοπραξίαν διετετάκτο, τὶς δὲ ἐντολὴ καὶ πρᾶξις ὁμοίως εἴρητο ἢ εἰς μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ <ἦ> διὰ τὸ σκληροκάρδιον τοῦ λαοῦ ὑμῶν. . . . δεῖ ἐπιγνῶναι, δι' ἧς ὁδοῦ ἄφεσις ὑμῖν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν γενήσεται καὶ ἐλπίς τῆς κληρονομίας τῶν κατηγγελεμένων ἀγαθῶν· ἔστι δ' οὐκ ἄλλη ἢ αὕτη, ἵνα τοῦτον τὸν Χριστὸν ἐπιγνόντες καὶ λουσάμενοι τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν διὰ Ἡσαΐου κηρυχθὲν λουτρὸν ἀναμαρτήτως λοιπὸν ζήσητε.

And you <still> deceive yourselves when you suppose that, because you are offspring of Abraham according to the flesh, you will certainly inherit the good things proclaimed to be given from God through Christ. For no one can by any means receive them except those who, in mind, have been conformed to the faith of Abraham, and who recognize all the mysteries (of the Jewish scriptures). For I say that some precepts have been ordered for the worship of God and the practice of virtue, and similarly some commandments and customs were spoken either with reference to the mystery of Christ <or> on account of the stubbornness of your people. . . . It is necessary to know the way by which forgiveness of sins and a hope of the inheritance of good things that have been proclaimed will be yours. There is no other way but this: that you know this Christ and are washed in the fountain (i.e., of baptism) for the forgiveness of sins, as has been announced by Isaiah, and henceforth live without sin. (*Dial.* 44.1–2, 4)

He indicates that physical Jews need to meet certain criteria to become beneficiaries of their legacy: they must possess the same faith as Abraham, recognize all the mysteries of the Jewish scriptures,⁵³ and receive cleansing through Christian baptism. Although these particular qualifications differ from those described in Luke-Acts, Justin similarly asserts in this context that a physical genealogical connection to Abraham would not ensure participation in the blessings promised to his descendants.

⁵³ In this context, approval of “all the mysteries” refers to the recognition and acceptance of the mysterious manner in which some of the commandments of scripture were arranged to contain coded truths about “the mystery of Christ” (*Dial.* 44.2; cf. 125.3–5). For further discussion of this passage, see Theodore Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law* (SBLDS 20; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), 53–63; Skar-saune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 323–4.

Again, in his portrayal of the eschatological feast, Justin highlights the necessity of repentance in a manner that corresponds to the emphasis in Luke. In *Dial.* 76.3–5, Justin appears to follow a source that most closely resembles Matt 8:11–12,⁵⁴ but he contextualizes his presentation of this material in order to draw attention to the plight of the wicked and their need for repentance. For example, he prefaces his description of the eschatological feast by contrasting those who please the Father with those who withdraw from his will:

Καὶ Ἡσαΐας δὲ μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελον αὐτὸν εἰπών, οὐχὶ τούτων ὥνπερ ἐδίδαξεν ἔλθων διδάσκαλον αὐτὸν γεγενῆσθαι προεκήρυσσεν; Ἄ γὰρ μεγάλα ἐβεβούλευτο ὁ πατὴρ εἰς τε πάντας τοὺς εὐαρέστους γενομένους αὐτῷ καὶ γεννησομένους ἀνθρώπους, καὶ τοὺς ἀποστάντας τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ ὁμοίως ἀνθρώπους ἢ ἀγγέλους, οὗτος μόνος ἀπαρακαλύπτως ἐδίδαξεν, εἰπών· Ἦξουσιν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν, καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαάκ καὶ Ἰακώβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον. Καί· Πολλοὶ ἐροῦσί μοι τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ· Κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν καὶ προεφητεύσαμεν καὶ δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν; Καὶ ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς· Ἀναχωρεῖτε ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ. Καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις λόγοις, οἷς καταδικάζειν τοὺς ἀναξίους μὴ σφῆζεσθαι μέλλει, ἔφη ἐρεῖν· Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, ὃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ πατὴρ τῷ Σατανᾷ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.

And, when he called him an angel of great counsel, did Isaiah not predict that he (i.e., Christ) would become a teacher of these things which he taught when he came? For he alone taught openly what great things the Father had intended for all those who were and would be pleasing to him, and for those who withdrew from his will, humans and angels alike, saying, “They shall come from east and west, and shall recline at table with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of the heavens; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness” (cf. Matt 8:11–12). And “Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not eat and drink and prophesy and cast out demons in your name? And I will say to them: ‘Depart from me’” (cf. Matt 7:22–23; Luke 13:26). And, in other words, with which he condemns those who are not worthy to be saved, he said: “Depart into outer darkness, which the Father prepared for Satan and his angels” (cf. Matt 25:41). (*Dial.* 76.3–5)

⁵⁴ The descriptions of the eschatological feast in *Dial.* 76.4, 120.5–6, and 140.4 are almost identical to each other, with a few minor variations, and clearly rely on Matt 8:11–12 or a source that closely parallels it. For further discussion see A. J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* (NovTSup 17; Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1967), 28–30.

Through the addition of two other Matthean sayings, Justin emphasizes the rejection of the wicked; those who are not worthy to be saved will experience exclusion.⁵⁵ Thus, although Justin relies primarily upon Matthean material, his presentation of the eschatological feast highlights the rejection of the wicked in a manner that corresponds to Luke 13:22–30.⁵⁶

In still another passage, *Dial.* 120.5–6, Justin refers to the end-time feast in the course of describing a division between wicked and righteous Jews. Prior to referring to the eschatological feast, Justin explains that the martyrdom of Isaiah, by being sawn in half, served as a symbolic representation of a division of the Jewish nation:

τὰ περὶ τὸν θάνατον Ἡσαίου, ὃν πρόνι ξυλίνῳ ἐπρίσατε, μυστήριον <ὄν> καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ τέμνειν ὑμῶν τὸ γένος διχῇ μέλλοντος, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀξίους σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατριάρχαις καὶ προφήταις τῆς αἰωνίου βασιλείας καταξιῶν [μέλλοντος], τοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν καταδίκην τοῦ ἀσβέστου πυρὸς σὺν τοῖς ὁμοίοις ἀπειθέσι καὶ ἀμεταθέτοις ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν πέμψειν ἤδη φήσαντος. Ἦξουσι γάρ, εἶπεν, ἀπὸ δυσμῶν καὶ ἀνατολῶν, καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον.

The things concerning the death of Isaiah, whom you sawed in half with a wooden saw, are also a mystery of Christ, who is going to cut your race in two, and [is going] to esteem, on the one hand, those who are worthy of the eternal kingdom with the holy patriarchs and prophets, but to send the rest, on the other hand, as he already said, to the condemnation of unquenchable fire with those from all the nations who are likewise disobedient and unrepentant. He said: “For they will come from east and west, and recline at table with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom will be cast out into outer darkness” (cf. Matt 8:11–12).

(*Dial.* 120.5–6)

In this context, Justin describes a division between worthy and unworthy Jews and consigns the disobedient and unrepentant to eternal punishment. As in *Dial.* 76.3–5, this description parallels the account of the exclusion of wicked Jews in Luke 13. Yet, for Justin, the division

⁵⁵ Compare *1 Apol.* 16.9–13 where Justin combines a similar set of sayings in order to stress the necessity of obedience. In this context, however, Justin does not clearly refer to the eschatological feast.

⁵⁶ Note also that the phrase ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν appears to rely on a Lukan tradition (Luke 13:26).

more clearly involves the nations as well;⁵⁷ both Jews and non-Jews receive or are excluded from the future blessings associated with Abraham on the basis of their obedience and repentance.⁵⁸

Although Jeffrey Siker argues that Justin uses the portrait of an eschatological pilgrimage and feast to illustrate a contrast between non-Jewish Christ-believers and Jews,⁵⁹ this does not seem to be Justin's primary concern in his use of this image. Although Justin elsewhere typically draws a contrast between these two groups, and frequently describes the exclusion of the Jewish nation, the descriptions of an end-time feast in *Dial.* 76.3–5 and 120.5–6 serve as rare examples where Justin does not correlate a division between the obedient and disobedient with a distinction between Jews and non-Jews. Instead, he anticipates that Jews who repent and obey will qualify to receive Abrahamic blessings in the coming age.

5.3.2.2 *The Descendants of Abraham and the Inclusion of Non-Jews*
As Skarsaune and O'Neill have both noted, the speech of Stephen in Acts 7 expresses a view that resembles the description of Jews in the writings of Justin: the Lukan Stephen and Justin accuse Jews of resist-

⁵⁷ Although the phrase "many will come from east and west, north and south" in Luke 13:29 may foreshadow the inclusion of the nations, Luke does not make this explicit nor does he describe a division between righteous non-Jews and unrepentant Jews in this parable.

⁵⁸ In *Dialogue* 139–140, Justin prefaces yet another reference to the eschatological feast by asserting that the descendants of "Japheth" (symbolizing the Romans) would eventually take the promised land away from Jews as part of the fulfillment of Gen 9:24–27. In this context, he further warns that the children of Abraham who are "sinners, and faithless, and disobedient towards God" should not expect to receive an everlasting kingdom in the eschatological age. He maintains that although Daniel, Noah, and Jacob might pray for sons and daughters, their request would not be granted since all will receive reward and punishment for their own actions (*Dial.* 140.3; cf. Ezek 14:20; 18:4–20; Deut 24:16). Subsequently, he describes the eschatological feast (*Dial.* 140.4; cf. Matt 8:11–12) and emphasizes the role of volition in determining one's plight in the eschatological future: "Besides, I have already shown that they who were foreknown as future sinners, whether humans or angels, do become so, not through God's fault, but each through his own fault." Similarly, in *Dialogue* 25–26, Justin warns that the physical descendants of Abraham should not assume that they will receive part of the "divine legacy" and an inheritance with the patriarchs if they do not repent.

⁵⁹ Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews*, 182–3. Rodney Werline, "The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr's 'Dialogue with Trypho,'" *HTR* 92 (1999): 86–7, also asserts that Justin uses Matt 8:11–12 as a source because it places Christ-believers at the feast together with the patriarchs. Werline argues that Justin in this way attempts to present Christ-believers as the true descendants and heirs of Abraham in *Dial.* 120.6.

ing the prophets, killing the “Just One,”⁶⁰ and practicing idolatry.⁶¹ For both Luke and Justin, this behavior disqualifies Jews from receiving the promises designated for the descendants of Abraham. Despite their common conclusion, Justin develops this theme in a manner that differs from Acts 7 by drawing a contrast between Jews and non-Jewish Christ-believers, and asserting that the latter would receive the promises and heritage originally intended for the physical descendants of Abraham.

In *Dial.* 92.1–5, for example, Justin argues that physical circumcision has no benefit since Abraham was justified because of his faith.⁶² This faith, Justin maintains, represents a “circumcision of the heart” that enables non-Jewish Christ-believers to become just and pleasing to God apart from physical circumcision.⁶³ Subsequently, Justin contrasts this group with Jews and asserts that God allowed the latter to practice rituals, sacrifices, and temple worship in order to prevent them from

⁶⁰ Note also the allusion to their murder of the “Just One” (ὁ δίκαιος) in *Dial.* 119.2, which parallels the accusation in Acts 7:52. See also *Dial.* 16.4, a text that associates the killing of Jesus, “the Just One,” with persecution of the prophets before him and with persecution of Christ-believers after him (cf. *Dial.* 108.2). This resembles the description of the death of Jesus in Acts 7:51. Compare also *Dial.* 17.2; 133.1–2; 136.3; 137.3. These latter passages cite LXX Isa 3:10 in reference to the persecution of ὁ δίκαιος. As O’Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 82–93, 142–3, notes, Luke and Justin both use the phrase ὁ δίκαιος in similar ways; cf. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 288–95; Acts 3:14; 7:52; cf. *1 Apology* 47–49; *Dial.* 16.4; 93.4; 108.2–3; 119.3; 133.2; 136.3.

⁶¹ Compare especially *Dialogue* 22 with Acts 7 and the citation of Isa 66:1–2 in both of these texts. Both *Dial.* 22.3–4 and Acts 7:42–43 also cite from Amos 5:25–26 (cf. *1 Apol.* 37.3–8). Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 124, 314–5, maintains that the differences between the forms of these citations suggests that Justin uses a written source that was different from Acts. Nevertheless, he suggests that the polemical use of Isa 66:1–2 in Acts 7:49–50 may lie behind the testimony source that Justin used. He rightly notes, however, that Justin’s description of temple worship as a practice that was permitted to prevent the idolatry of Jews (see, e.g., *Dial.* 18.5; 19.5–6; 20.4; 22.1–3, 11; 43.1; 67.8; 73.6; 102.6; 131.4; 132.2; 133.1; 136.3) differs from positive sentiments expressed toward the temple and the Mosaic law in Luke-Acts (see, e.g., Luke 1:59; 2:21; Acts 7:8; 16:3; 21:21–26). By contrast, Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire, 135–425* (New York: OUP, 1986), 86, argues that the speech of Stephen already contained the sentiments of Justin, including the idea that God only tolerated cultic worship and allowed it as a concession to prevent idolatry.

⁶² Justin often links the figure of Abraham with discussions about circumcision (*Dial.* 11.5; 16.2; 19.4; 23.3–4; 26.1; 27.5; 33.2; 43.1; 46.3–4; 47.1–4; 92.2–3; 113.6–7; 114.3–4). For further discussion, see Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews*, 165–70.

⁶³ Elsewhere, Justin explains that “circumcision of the heart” represents the proper understanding and reception of the words of the apostles and Christ that free Christ-believers from idolatry (*Dial.* 113.6–7; 114.3–4; cf. *Dial.* 28.2–3). He also refers to a “spiritual circumcision” that Christ-believers receive through baptism (*Dial.* 43.2).

committing idolatry (*Dial.* 92.4).⁶⁴ Justin even argues in this context that God permitted circumcision so that Jews could be marked off for punishment; that is, their circumcision served as a means of identifying them for expulsion from Jerusalem after the Bar Kokhba revolt (*Dial.* 92.2).⁶⁵ Thus, although both Luke and Justin link the idolatry of Jews with their failure to receive the inheritance promised to the descendants of Abraham, Justin goes further than Luke by expressing a sharper critique of Jews and Jewish practices,⁶⁶ presenting non-Jews as heirs to the legacy of Abraham, and characterizing the entire Jewish people as disobedient and therefore unfit to inherit the blessings of Abraham.

Similarly, in *Dial.* 130.1–4, Justin interprets Deut 32:43—“Rejoice, O nations with his people”—as a description of how non-Jews receive the inheritance promised to the descendants of Abraham. Although Justin affirms that certain Jews will receive an inheritance—the patriarchs, prophets, and all “from that people” who are pleasing to God (*Dial.* 130.2)—he proceeds to argue that the dispersion at the tower of Babel and the subsequent election of Israel was nothing but a symbolic foreshadowing of the election of non-Jewish Christ-believers:

Ἐπειπεῖν δὲ ὑμῖν βούλομαι [καὶ] πρὸς τοῦτοις, ὧ ἄνδρες, ἔφην, καὶ ἄλλους τινὰς λόγους ἀπ’ αὐτῶν τῶν Μωσέως λόγων, ἐξ ὧν [καὶ] νοῆσαι δύνασθε ὅτι ἄνωθεν μὲν πάντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὁ θεὸς διεσκόρπισε κατὰ γένη καὶ γλώσσας· ἐκ πάντων δὲ τῶν γενῶν γένος ἑαυτῷ λαβὼν τὸ ὑμέτερον,

⁶⁴ According to Justin, God instituted circumcision and ritual law because of his foreknowledge of Israel’s unbelief and disobedience (*Dial.* 12.3; 18.2; 21.1; 22.2; 43.1; 44.2; 46.5; 67.8; 92.4).

⁶⁵ Justin maintains that the expulsion of Jews from their land in 135 CE occurred as punishment for sin and as the fulfillment of prophecy, and claims that God gave circumcision to Abraham because he knew that they would need to be marked off from other peoples in order to be punished by expulsion from Jerusalem (see, e.g., *Dial.* 16.2; 19.5; 25.5; 92.2; cf. *1 Apology* 47–8). This forms part of his argument that Jews are by nature disobedient and therefore unfit to become heirs to the Abrahamic legacy (e.g., *Dial.* 92.3–5); cf. Annette Reed, “The Trickery of the Fallen Angels and the Demonic Mimesis of the Divine: Aetiology, Demonology, and Polemics in the Writings of Justin Martyr,” *J ECS* (2004): 155–6.

⁶⁶ Although the speech of Stephen outlines the past idolatry of Israel (Acts 7:39–43) and indicates that “the Most High does not dwell in houses made with human hands” (7:48), these descriptions of Jews and their temple do not go beyond those found in the Jewish scriptures. For example, the recognition of the limitations of the temple also appears to be part of the perspective offered in the prayer of Solomon as recorded by the Deuteronomist in 1 Kgs 8:27: “But will God indeed dwell on earth? Even heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain you, much less this house that I have built” (cf. 2 Chron 6:18).

γένος ἄχρηστον καὶ ἀπειθές καὶ ἄπιστον <ὄν>, <ἐ>δειξε τοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς γένους αἱρουμένους πεπειῖσθαι αὐτοῦ τῇ βουλῇ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃν καὶ Ἰακώβ καλεῖ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ ὀνομάζει, τούτους καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ, ὡς προέφην ἐν πολλοῖς, εἶναι δεῖ<ν>. Εὐφράνθητε γάρ, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰπών, τὴν μὲν ὁμοίαν αὐτοῖς ἀπονέμει κληρονομίαν, καὶ τὴν ὁμοίαν ὀνομασίαν δίδωσιν· ἔθνη δὲ αὐτούς καὶ εὐφραινομένους μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ λέγων, εἰς ὄνειδος τὸ ὑμέτερον φέρει ἔθνος. Ὅν γάρ καὶ ὑμεῖς τρόπον παρωργίσατε <αὐτὸν> εἰδωλολατρήσαντες, οὕτω καὶ αὐτούς, εἰδωλολάτρας <πάλαι> ὄντας, κατηξίωσε γνῶναι τὴν βουλήν αὐτοῦ καὶ κληρονομήσαι τὴν κληρονομίαν τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ.

O men, I said, now I wish [also] to add to these for you, even certain other passages from the very words of Moses from which you are [also] able to understand that in the beginning God dispersed all humans according to races and languages. But from all these races he took for himself your race, a useless, disobedient, and faithless race. And he showed that those chosen from every race have obeyed his will through Christ, whom he calls Jacob, and names Israel, and these must be Jacob and Israel, as I have said before many times. For, when he says, “Rejoice, you nations, with his people” (Deut 32:43), he allots to them a similar inheritance and gives a similar name; but when he calls them nations and states that they rejoice with his people, he brings reproach to your nation. For just as you angered <him> by acts of idolatry, so he has deemed them, though they were <formerly> idolaters,⁶⁷ worthy to know his will and to share in the inheritance that is from him.

(*Dial.* 130.3–4)

Justin here describes Jews as “a useless, disobedient, and faithless race” (*Dial.* 130.3) and asserts that God reproaches them because he was angered by their idolatry (*Dial.* 130.4). Conversely, he claims that non-Jewish Christ-believers have become the elect of God and consequently heirs of the legacy of “Israel” and “Jacob” on the basis of their obedience (*Dial.* 130.4).

Dialogue 119 provides an especially vivid example of both the similarities and differences between the presentation of the recipients

⁶⁷ Although Thomas P. Halton, *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho* (ed. Michael Slusser; Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2003), 197, translates the phrase εἰδωλολάτρας ὄντας as “though they are likewise idolaters,” A. Cleveland Coxe, James Donaldson, and Alexander Roberts, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325* rev. (10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 1:265, render it as “those who were idolaters.” Noting that Justin elsewhere refers to the former idolatrous practices of Christ-believers (*Dial.* 30.3; 46.7; 111.4), Miroslav Marcovich, ed. *Iustini Martyris: Apologiae pro Christianis, Dialogus cum Tryphone* (PTS 38; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 295, suggests the addendum εἰδωλολάτρας <πάλαι> ὄντας.

of Abrahamic promises in the writings of Luke and Justin. In *Dial.* 119.1–2, Justin reads Deut 32:16–23 as a denunciation of the idolatry of present-day Jews but interprets Zech 2:11 and Isa 62:12 as descriptions of Christ-believers, the new and holy people of God:

Παρώξυνάν με ἐπ’ ἀλλοτρίοις, ἐν βδελύγμασιν αὐτῶν ἐξεπίκρανάν με· ἔθυσαν δαιμονίοις οἷς οὐκ οἶδασι . . . Καὶ εἶδε κύριος καὶ ἐζήλωσε, καὶ παρωξύνθη δι’ ὀργὴν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ θυγατέρων. Καὶ εἶπεν· Ἀποστρέψω τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπ’ αὐτῶν, καὶ δείξω τί ἔσται αὐτοῖς ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων· ὅτι γενεὰ ἐξεστραμμένη ἐστίν, υἱοὶ οἷς οὐκ ἔστι πίστις ἐν αὐτοῖς. . . . Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀναιρεθῆναι τὸν δίκαιον ἐκεῖνον ἡμεῖς λαὸς ἕτερος ἀνεθάλαμεν, καὶ ἐβλαστήσαμεν στάχυες καινοὶ καὶ εὐθαλεῖς, ὥς ἔφασαν οἱ προφῆται· Καὶ καταφεύζονται ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ <καὶ ἔσονται αὐτῷ> εἰς λαόν, καὶ κατασκηνώσουσιν ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς πάσης. Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ μόνον λαός, ἀλλὰ καὶ λαὸς ἅγιος ἐσμεν, ὥς ἐδείξαμεν ἤδη· Καὶ καλέσουσιν αὐτὸν λαὸν ἅγιον, λευκωμένον ὑπὸ κυρίου.

They provoked me with strange gods; they angered me with their abominations. They sacrificed to demons whom they knew not. . . . And the Lord saw, and was jealous, and was provoked because of the anger of his sons and daughters. And he said: “I will turn away my face from them, and I will show what their end shall be; for it is a perverse generation, children in whom there is no faith. . . .” (Deut 32:16–23).⁶⁸ And after that Just One was put to death, we blossomed forth as another people, and sprang up like new and thriving corn, as the prophets said: “And many nations shall flee for refuge to the Lord on that day <and shall be to him> for a people; and they shall dwell in the midst of the whole earth” (Zech 2:11). But we are not only a people, but we are a holy people, as we have already shown: “And they shall call them a holy people, redeemed by the Lord” (Isa 62:12).

(*Dial.* 119.2–3)

To some extent, this distinction between Christ-believers and Jews resembles the contrast between Christ-believing Jews and their opponents (e.g., Cyrenians, Alexandrians, and the Sanhedrin) in Acts 7. Beyond distinguishing between faithful and idolatrous Jews, however, Justin asserts that non-Jews who believe in Jesus become the offspring of Abraham. In *Dial.* 119.4, Justin argues that, by promising Abraham

⁶⁸ There are only a few minor variants and one omission in this citation of LXX Deut 32:16–23. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 53, suggests that Rom 10:19 might have been Justin’s guide for the citation. For further discussion, see also J. Smith Sibinga, *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr I: The Pentateuch* (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 99, 144–5; Pierre Prigent, *Justin et L’Ancien Testament: L’argumentation scripturaire du traité de Justin contre toutes les hérésies comme source principale du Dialogue avec Tryphon et de la Première Apologie* (Ebib; Paris: Lecoffre, 1964), 288.

that he would be the father of many nations (Gen 17:4), God did not refer to Arabs, Idumeans, and other peoples, but rather to a specific people who became his descendants:

Οὐκοῦν <οὐ μόνον> οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητος δῆμός ἐσμεν οὐδὲ βάρβαρον φύλον οὐδὲ ὁποῖα Καρῶν ἢ Φρυγῶν ἔθνη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεὸς καὶ ἐμφανὲς ἐγενήθη τοῖς μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτόν.... Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἔθνος, ὃ πάλαι τῷ Ἀβραάμ ὁ θεὸς ὑπέσχετο καὶ πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν θήσιν ἐπηγγείλατο, οὐκ Ἀρράβων οὐδ' Αἰγυπτίων οὐδ' Ἰδουμαίων λέγων· ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἰσμαὴλ μεγάλου πατὴρ ἔθνο<υ>ς ἐγένετο καὶ Ἡσαῦ, καὶ Ἀμμανιτῶν ἐστὶ νῦν πολὺ πλῆθος.

Wherefore, <not only> are we not a contemptible people, nor a barbarian tribe, nor as the Carian or Phrygian nations, but God even chose us and appeared to those who did not ask for him.... For, this is that nation which God promised to Abraham long ago, and announced that he would establish him as a father of many nations, not saying (that he would be the father) of the Arabs or of the Egyptians or of the Idumeans, since Ishmael also became the father of a mighty nation and so did Esau, and there is now a great multitude of Ammonites.

(*Dial.* 119.4)

In his view, since Christ-believers hear and obey the voice of Christ, they represent the righteous nation promised to Abraham:

Τί οὖν πλέον ἐνθάδε ὁ Χριστὸς χαρίζεται τῷ Ἀβραάμ; Ὅτι διὰ τῆς ὁμοίας κλήσεως φωνῇ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτόν, εἰπὼν ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐν ᾗ ὥκει. Καὶ ἡμᾶς δὲ ἅπαντας δι' ἐκείνης τῆς φωνῆς ἐκάλεσε, καὶ ἐξήλθομεν ἤδη ἀπὸ τῆς πολιτείας, ἐν ᾗ ἐζῶμεν κατὰ τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ἄλλων τῆς γῆς οἰκητόρων, κακῶς ζῶντες· καὶ σὺν τῷ Ἀβραάμ τὴν ἁγίαν κληρονομήσομεν γῆν, εἰς τὸν ἀπέραντον αἰῶνα τὴν κληρονομίαν ληψόμενοι, τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ διὰ τὴν ὁμοίαν πίστιν ὄντες. Ὅν γὰρ τρόπον ἐκεῖνος τῇ φωνῇ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπίστευσε καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ἡμεῖς τῇ φωνῇ τοῦ θεοῦ, τῇ διὰ τε τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ λαληθείᾳ πάλιν καὶ τῇ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κηρυχθείᾳ ἡμῖν, πιστεύσαντες μέχρι τοῦ ἀποθνήσκειν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἀπεταζάμεθα. Ὁμοίοπiston οὖν τι ἔθνος καὶ θεοσεβὲς καὶ δίκαιον, εὐφραῖνον τὸν πατέρα, ὑπισχνεῖται αὐτῷ, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὑμᾶς, οἷς οὐκ ἔστι πίστις ἐν αὐτοῖς.

Now what greater favor, then, did Christ bestow on Abraham? That by the same calling he called him with (his) voice, saying to leave the land in which he dwelt. And by that voice he has also called us all, and we have now abandoned the way of life in which we used live, practicing evil according to what is common to the other inhabitants of the earth. And we shall inherit the holy land together with Abraham, receiving the inheritance for all eternity, since we are children of Abraham because of similar faith. For just as he believed the voice of God, and it was accounted to him as righteousness, so in the same manner we

believed the voice of God—that was spoken again through the apostles of Christ and that was proclaimed to us through the prophets—and have renounced all the things in the world even unto death. Therefore, he (God) promised to him (Abraham) a certain nation, one with like faith, God-fearing, righteous, and a delight to the Father; but it is not you, “in whom there is no faith” (Deut 32:20).
(*Dial.* 119.5–6)

For Justin, then, obedience and faith in the words of the prophets and the testimony of the apostles qualifies non-Jews to become heirs of the land and blessings that God promised to the descendants of Abraham (cf. *Dial.* 138.3; 139.5). In other words, to hear and obey Christ is to act in the same way that Abraham did and thereby become part of the chosen nation and legacy that God promised to him long ago (*Dial.* 119.4).

In *Dial.* 119.5–6, the reasoning that Justin uses to present non-Jewish Christ-believers as descendants of Abraham resembles the arguments of Paul in Romans 4 and Galatians 3: non-Jews become heirs to the legacy of Abraham because they are blessed with and justified by the same faith as Abraham.⁶⁹ By also arguing that the repentance, piety, and obedience of Christ-believers commend them as descendants of Abraham, Justin adds an element to the Pauline description of justification by faith that resembles the emphasis in Luke-Acts (e.g., Luke 3:7–9; 13:22–30; Acts 7:2–53).⁷⁰ Justin thus follows a Pauline line

⁶⁹ Similarly, in *Dial.* 11.5, Justin follows the logic of Paul by asserting that since Abraham was approved and blessed by God while he was still uncircumcised, non-Jews who have faith in Christ become his descendants (cf. Rom 4:13–25). *Dial.* 11.5 (cf. *Dial.* 119.4) and Rom 4:17 both cite or allude to Gen 17:4. As Werline, “Pauline Arguments,” 84–6, notes, however, Paul indicates that Jews and non-Jews both trace their lineage to Abraham whereas Justin asserts that non-Jewish Christ-believers replace Jews. Although Justin (*Dial.* 119.6) and Paul (Gal 3:8–9) appeal to Gen 15:6 and declare that non-Jewish Christ-believers obtain righteousness in the same manner as Abraham, Werline argues that Paul describes the justification of Abraham by faith to show that both Jew and non-Jew inherit the promises made to Abraham (Gal 3:28–29) whereas Justin uses this argument, together with prophetic texts, to claim that Christ-believers represent true Israel rather than Jews; cf. Craig D. Allert, *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Trypho* (VCSup 64; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 172–4.

⁷⁰ Certainly, Paul also describes the piety of Christ-believers, and their repentance from idolatry (see, especially, 1 Thess 1:9). Although Paul also highlights the central role of obedience in the lifestyle of Christ-believers (e.g., Romans 6–8; Galatians 5), for Justin, these attributes demonstrate that Christ-believers are the true children of Abraham. This differs from Paul’s emphasis on faith as the qualifying characteristic of the descendants of Abraham.

of thought insofar as he argues that non-Jewish Christ-believers have become descendants and heirs of Abraham but follows a Lukan line of thought insofar as he presents repentance and obedience as central qualities of the children of Abraham (*Dial.* 119.6; cf. 11.5).⁷¹

Summary

Both Luke and Justin portray repentance and obedience as distinguishing marks of Jews who receive the blessings and heritage promised to the seed of Abraham. This perspective resembles that of a number of early Jewish interpreters who differentiate between their groups and other Jews on the basis of their repentance and covenant fidelity, as well as their interpretation of the Jewish scriptures. Nevertheless, whereas Luke describes a division between repentant and unrepentant Jews, and defines only the former group as the true children of Abraham, Justin more typically presents non-Jewish Christ-believers as the descendants of Abraham and rightful heirs of the promises originally made to Jews.

5.4 ISAIANIC PROMISES

5.4.1 *Isaianic Promises in Luke-Acts*

As noted in Chapter Four, Luke depicts the scriptural interpretation and message of the Christ-believing community as the realization of the illumination of the nations that Isaiah foretells (e.g., Luke 2:30–32; 3:4–6; 4:16–31; 24:44–49; Acts 1:8; 13:46–47; 26:17–18, 23). In his development of this theme, moreover, Luke indicates that Jews and non-Jews become recipients of different aspects of Isaianic promises—those that relate to Israel and to the nations respectively. Besides presenting Jesus as the mediator of restoration for Israel and illumination for the nations, Luke presents the eleven, Paul, and Barnabas as servants of YHWH who announce salvation for Jews and non-Jews through their proclamation of the message of Jesus and his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures (Luke 24:44–49; cf. Acts 1:8; Acts 13:46–47; 26:17–18,

⁷¹ Likewise, in *Dial.* 11.4, Justin highlights the repentance and obedience of Christ-believers, and presents this transformation in their lifestyle as evidence that they have become the descendants and heirs of Abraham. Again, in *Dial.* 23.4–5, Justin affirms that Abraham was justified because of his faith, but further argues that the righteousness of Christ-believers is determined through “acts of piety and justice” (*Dial.* 23.5).

23). In this sense, both Jesus and leading Jewish Christ-believers participate in the fulfillment of Isaianic promises that refer to the servant of YHWH while Jews and non-Jews who embrace their message and scriptural interpretation become recipients of the restoration and illumination promised in passages such as Isa 42:6–7 and 49:6.

Luke 2:25–32 serves as an example of how Luke assigns different aspects of the fulfillment of Isaianic promises to Jesus, Israel, and the nations. In this passage, Luke has Simeon identify Jesus as the source of salvation for all peoples but distinguish between Jews and non-Jews as beneficiaries of his intervention:

Νῦν ἀπολύεις τὸν δοῦλόν σου, δέσποτα, κατὰ τὸ ῥημά σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ· ὅτι εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου, ὃ ἡτοίμασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν, φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ.

Master, now you are dismissing your servant in peace, according to your word; for my eyes have seen your salvation, which you have prepared in the presence of all the peoples,⁷² a light for revelation to the nations and for glory to your people Israel.

(Luke 2:29–32)

The translation above places the term “light” (φῶς) in apposition to the phrase “your salvation” (τὸ σωτήριόν σου) and interprets “for” (εἰς) as the governing preposition of both “revelation” (ἀποκάλυψιν) and “glory” (δόξαν). This rendering characterizes the salvation of God as a type of enlightenment for both Israel and the nations.⁷³ Similarly, in Luke 3:6, Luke presents “the salvation” (τὸ σωτήριον) brought about by Christ as a form of illumination that “all flesh” will see (Isa 40:3–5).⁷⁴

⁷² George D. Kilpatrick, “*Laos* at Luke 2:31 and Acts 4:25, 27,” *JTS* 16 (1965): 127, argues that earlier commentators wrongly interpreted τῶν λαῶν (Luke 2:31) as a reference to the nations. He notes that Luke may have intended to change τῶν ἐθνῶν, from Isa 52:10, to τῶν λαῶν in order to apply this text to Jews. Others such as Bock, *Luke*, 1:243; Nolland, *Luke*, 1:120; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:428, rightly point out that, in light of the subsequent references to Israel and the nations in Luke 2:32, πάντων τῶν λαῶν in Luke 2:31 probably refers to both Jews and non-Jews.

⁷³ So also Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:428; Bock, *Luke*, 1:244. Alternatively, “light” (φῶς) and “glory” (δόξαν) may both stand in apposition to “salvation” in which case Luke 2:32 anticipates how Jews and non-Jews experience the coming salvation in distinctive ways: light for non-Jews and glory for Israel. So Plummer, *Luke*, 69; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 1:206; Bovon, *Luke*, 103. In either case, Luke 2:32 clearly indicates that both groups would participate in the coming salvation of God but also assumes that they will retain their distinct identity as Jews and non-Jews in this era.

⁷⁴ As Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:40, notes, the neuter form τὸ σωτήριον appears only four times in the NT, three of which occur in Luke-Acts (Luke 2:32; 3:6; Acts

Although all peoples have an equal share in salvation, Luke 2:32 refers to Jews and non-Jews as distinct entities. To Israel, the coming salvation and light would be “for glory” whereas, to the nations, it would be “for revelation.”⁷⁵

Similarly, Luke indicates that Paul was commissioned as a witness and mediator of the illumination that Isaiah promised by having Paul explain that God sent him to open people’s eyes, and turn them from darkness to light (Acts 26:16–18; cf. Isa 42:6–7). In this description, the Lukan Paul differentiates between Jews and non-Jews by indicating that he was rescued from but also sent to “the people” and “the nations” (ἐξαιρούμενός σε ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰς οὓς ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε, Acts 26:17). Likewise, when Luke has Paul describe Jesus as the mediator of this illumination, he distinguishes between Jews and non-Jews by explaining that Jesus proclaims light “both to our people and to the nations” (τῷ τε λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, Acts 26:23). Therefore, although Luke indicates that all people receive the salvation and illumination that Isaiah promises, he recognizes that they do so as Jews and non-Jews. This interpretation corresponds to the Isaianic promise that the servant of YHWH would effect God’s salvation for Israel and the nations.

Despite the effort of Luke to present Jews and non-Jews as legitimate heirs of Isaianic promises made to Israel and the nations, he also indicates that some Jews reject the deliverance that Jesus provides for them (e.g., Luke 4:16–31; Acts 13:46–47). Since Luke also presents non-Jews as beneficiaries of the fulfillment of Isaianic promises, it is possible that, in some instances, he envisages a transfer of scriptural promises from Jews to non-Jews. Because Luke 4:16–18 and Acts 13:46–47 explicitly cite passages from Isaiah that foretell the

28:28; Eph 2:3). Tannehill suggests that Isa 40:5 forms the scriptural basis for the occurrences of τὸ σωτήριον in Luke-Acts; cf. Jacques Dupont, *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (trans. John R. Keating; New York: Paulist, 1979), 16; Marshall, *Luke*, 137; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 160; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:428; Nolland, *Luke*, 1:114; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 40. Note, however, that Luke omits the phrase καὶ ὀφθήσεται ἡ δόξα κυρίου from Isa 40:5a. Nolland, *Luke*, 1:144, suggests that this is because “glory” did not aptly describe the public ministry of Jesus; cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 137. Some scholars also argue that Luke includes the part of Isa 40:5 that contains the reference to “all flesh” since this is in keeping with his interest in demonstrating the universality of God’s salvation. See, e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:461; Marshall, *Luke*, 137; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 1:160–1.

⁷⁵ As Bovon, *Luke*, 103, notes, “the usual separation between Israel and the Gentiles is respected” in Luke 2:32.

restoration of Israel in contexts where Jews also reject the message of Christ and Christ-believers, they serve as important test cases for exploring this possibility.

In Luke 4:16–21, the Lukan Jesus announces that he will effect a liberation for the people of God that Isaiah foretold (Isa 61:1–2; cf. Isa 58:6):⁷⁶

Καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρά, οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι. καὶ ἐπεδόθη αὐτῷ βιβλίον τοῦ προφήτου Ἡσαΐου καὶ ἀναπτύξας τὸ βιβλίον εὗρεν τὸν τόπον οὗ ἦν γεγραμμένον, Πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ’ ἐμὲ οὐ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, ἀπέσταλκέν με, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφ᾽ ἑσέι, κηρύξαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν. καὶ πτύξας τὸ βιβλίον ἀποδοὺς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ ἐκάθισεν· καὶ πάντων οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ. ἤρξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι Σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφή αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὠσιν ὑμῶν.

And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up; and according to his custom, he entered the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up to read. And the scroll of the prophet Isaiah was handed to him. And he unrolled the scroll, and found the place where it was written, “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovery of sight to the blind, to set free those who are oppressed, to proclaim the favorable year of the Lord.” And he rolled up the scroll, and gave it back to the attendant, and sat down; and the eyes of all in the synagogue were fixed upon him. And he began to say to them, “Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing.”
(Luke 4:16–21)

The four infinitival phrases in his citation of Isa 61:1–2 (58:6) outline the activities that he will perform in this role: “to preach the gospel to the poor,” “to proclaim release to captives, and recovery of sight

⁷⁶ In this passage, Luke appears to identify Jesus as the same type of servant or messenger described in Isaiah 40–55. Commentators often note the similarities between Isaiah 61 and Isaiah 40–55. See, for example, W. A. M. Beuken, “Servant and Herald of Good Tidings: Isaiah 61 as an Interpretation of Isaiah 40–55,” in *The Book of Isaiah = Le livre d’Isaïe: Les oracles et leurs relectures unité et complexité de l’ouvrage* (BETL 81; ed., J. Vermeylen; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), 411–42; C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66: A Commentary* (OTL; trans. J. J. Scullion; London: SPCK, 1986), 365–7; R. N. Whybray, *Isaiah 40–66* (NCB; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1975), 240. For further discussion of Luke’s use of Isaiah as a unified whole, see Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (JSNTSup 110; Sheffield: SAP, 1995), 226–49.

to the blind,” “to set free those who are oppressed,” and “to proclaim the favorable year of the Lord.” The added phrase “to set free those who are oppressed” from Isa 58:6 accentuates the element of release (ἄφεσις) in his ministry.⁷⁷ This addition, together with the reference to “the favorable year of the Lord” (Luke 4:19), suggests that Luke also wishes to portray Jesus as the agent of an end-time Jubilee liberation (ἄφεσις).⁷⁸ By having Jesus present himself as the herald and agent of such a release, Luke highlights that Jesus both announces and effects the fulfillment of scriptural promises for Israel.⁷⁹

Initially, the people of Nazareth receive the declaration of Jesus favorably, and seem to expect that they will become the primary beneficiaries of his fulfillment of scriptural promises (Luke 4:22). The mood of the group soon changes, however, when Jesus explains that his ministry will not meet their expectations:

καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, Πάντως ἐρεῖτέ μοι τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην· Ἰατρέ, θεράπευσον σεαυτόν· ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γενόμενα εἰς τὴν Καφαρναοὺμ ποίησον καὶ ὧδε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου. εἶπεν δέ, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ. ἐπ’ ἀληθείας δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, πολλοὶ χῆραι ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡλίου ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτε ἐκλείσθη ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐπὶ ἑτὴ τρία καὶ μῆνας ἕξ, ὥς ἐγένετο λιμὸς μέγας ἐπὶ πάσαν

⁷⁷ It appears as if Luke omitted the phrase *ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ* from LXX Isa 61:1 and inserted the phrase *ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει*, which is almost identical to *ἀπόστελλε τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει* from LXX Isa 58:6.

⁷⁸ See also the use of this term in Leviticus 25 and 27. Luke probably connects the two Isaianic passages because of their common reference to *ἄφεσις*. For further discussion of this and other adaptations to LXX Isa 61:1–2, and textual variants, see Bock, *Proclamation*, 105–11; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 72. For further discussion of the use of the Jubilee theme in Luke 4:16–21, the gospel of Luke, and Isa 61:1–2, see Robert B. Sloan, *The Favorable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubiliary Theology in the Gospel of Luke* (Austin: Schola, 1977); Green, *Luke*, 212–3; Paul Hertig, “The Jubilee Mission of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke: Reversals of Fortunes,” *Missiology* 26 (1998): 177; Nolland, *Luke*, 1:197; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:72.

⁷⁹ Bock, *Proclamation*, 105–11, argues that Luke presents Jesus as the messiah-servant who fulfills messianic and prophetic roles by both proclaiming and effecting salvation; cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 178, who concludes that this passage presents Jesus as the eschatological prophet who should also be identified with the messiah and servant that Isaiah anticipates. Although E. Earle Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1981), 98, argues that Luke 4:16–21 portrays Jesus as the servant of YHWH, Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:529, maintains that since Isaiah 61 does not form part of the Servant Songs, Jesus is better understood as an anointed prophet in this context. Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 226–49, argues convincingly that Luke’s use of Isaiah as a unified source enables him to link the roles of Jesus as servant, messiah, and prophet-herald together.

τὴν γῆν, καὶ πρὸς οὐδεμίαν αὐτῶν ἐπέμφθη Ἡλίας εἰ μὴ εἰς Σάρεπτα τῆς Σιδωνίας πρὸς γυναῖκα χήραν. καὶ πολλοὶ λεπροὶ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ Ἐλισαίου τοῦ προφήτου, καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἐκαθαρίσθη εἰ μὴ Ναϊμάν ὁ Σύρος. καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες θυμοῦ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἀκούοντες ταῦτα.

He said to them, "Surely you will quote to me this proverb, 'Physician, heal yourself! Whatever we have heard was done at Capernaum, do here also in your hometown.' And he said, "Truly I tell you, no prophet is accepted in his hometown. But I say to you the truth, there were many widows in Israel in the days of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when there was a great famine over all the land; and Elijah was sent to none of them except to a widow woman at Zarephath in Sidon. There were also many lepers in Israel in the time of the prophet Elisha, and none of them was cleansed except Naaman the Syrian." When they heard these things, all in the synagogue were filled with rage.

(Luke 4:23–28)

A number of scholars suggest that this negative reaction represents the beginning of a pattern that continues throughout Luke-Acts and culminates in Acts 28: Jews reject Jesus and his declaration of how he fulfils the Jewish scriptures, and therefore themselves experience exclusion.⁸⁰ Closely related to this assertion is the conclusion that Luke has Jesus appeal to the Elijah-Elisha narratives to portray non-Jews, rather than Jews, as the primary beneficiaries of the fulfillment of scriptural promises that he announces (Luke 4:25–27).⁸¹

⁸⁰ See, e.g., Plummer, *Luke*, 129; Conzelmann, *Luke*, 34–8, 114, 194; Haenchen, *Acts*, 101, 414, 417–8, 729–30; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 238; Gerhard Lohfink, *Die Sammlung Israel: Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (Münich: Kösel, 1975), 44–6; R. C. Tannehill, "The Mission of Jesus according to Luke IV 16–30," in *Jesus in Nazareth* (BZNW 40; ed. E. Grässer; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), 59–63; Wilson, *Gentile Mission*, 40–1; Jack T. Sanders, *The Jews in Luke-Acts* (London: SCM, 1987), 164–8; Maddox, *Purpose*, 2–6; Augustin George, "Israel dans l'œuvre de Luc" *RB* 75 (1968): 481–525; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:537; Nolland, *Luke*, 1:200; Joseph B. Tyson, "The Gentile Mission and the Authority of Scripture," *NTS* 33 (1987): 619–31; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 78–80.

⁸¹ For example, J. A. Sanders, "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4," in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (SJLA 12; ed. Jacob Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 98–9, has argued that Luke has Jesus refer to the maxim "Physician, heal yourself!" (Luke 4:23) and to the Elijah and Elisha traditions (Luke 4:25–27) in order to challenge the assumption of his audience that the promises of Isa 61:1–2 (58:6) apply exclusively to them. Sanders argues that the "prophetic hermeneutic" of Jesus serves to counter an early Jewish hermeneutical axiom (found in the Qumran literature) that claimed scriptural blessings for its own group but damnation for outsiders. He maintains that Luke transforms this axiom so that it functions as a polemic against Judaism and an

Although the opposition of the Nazareth crowd in Luke 4:16–30 appears to prefigure Jewish opposition to the message of Jesus in Acts, it is possible to argue that Luke does not use the Elijah-Elisha elements in the narrative to portray a transfer of Isaianic promises from Israel to non-Jews. Rather than describing how Isa 61:1–2 (58:6) would be fulfilled, Luke 4:24–27 illustrates the prophetic role of Jesus, both in his experience of rejection and in his ministry to outsiders.⁸² From this perspective, Luke uses two different types of scriptural precedents to describe the ministry of Jesus. In Luke 4:16–21, he has Jesus appeal to texts that foretell the restoration of Israel (Isa 61:1–2; 58:6) and announce that he is fulfilling these scriptural promises for Jews in the “here and now” in Nazareth and the surrounding regions (Luke 4:21; cf. 4:14–15, 31–44). When Luke foreshadows the inclusion of non-Jews, however, he has Jesus describe himself as a prophet and refer to scriptural stories that recount the ministry of prophets of Israel to non-Jews (1 Kgs 17:17–24; 2 Kgs 5:1–14).

The immediate narrative context exhibits a similar pattern and confirms this interpretation of Luke 4:16–30 (Luke 4:31–7:22). In Luke 7:22, Jesus responds to the inquiry of the disciples of John the Baptist regarding his identity (Luke 7:19a, 20) by stating the following: “Go and tell John what you have seen and heard: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, the poor have good news brought to them” (Luke 7:22b). Although this report originates from the double tradition,⁸³ it echoes terminology and themes from Luke 4:18–19.⁸⁴ The parallel passages in Luke 4:18–19 and 7:21–22 thus form an *inclusio* that marks off the

affirmation of the elect status of non-Jews; cf. Jeffrey S. Siker, “‘First to the Gentiles’: A Literary Analysis of Luke 4:16–30,” *JBL* 111 (1992): 83–9.

⁸² Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews*, 6–27, argues that this rejection of Jesus is limited to the members of the hometown of Nazareth, and is intended by Luke to verify the identity of Jesus as a prophet; cf. Rebecca I. Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 14; Sheffield: SAP, 1997), 138–9, 149. Similarly, B. J. Koet, *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 50–2, maintains that Luke appeals to Elijah and Elisha to “stimulate Israel to convert” (50) and receive the restoration that Jesus announced in Luke 4:16–21.

⁸³ Compare Matt 11:4–6.

⁸⁴ Compare the wording of Luke 4:18–19 with Luke 7:21–22. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:667, argues that the answer of Jesus in Luke 7:22 implies that he embodies the fulfillment of Isaianic promises. Similarly, Nolland, *Luke*, 1:330, maintains that Luke 7:22 presents the ministry of Jesus as a release that Isa 61:1–2; 58:6 describes. Ellis, *Luke*, 121, argues that Luke 7:22 clarifies the ministry of Jesus as messiah and servant of YHWH; cf.

initial events in the ministry of Jesus. Accordingly, the narrative material between Luke 4:16–30 and 7:21–22 provides the immediate context for recognizing how Luke portrays the realization of Isaianic promises.

Throughout Luke 4–7, Jesus directs his ministry toward Jews by performing exorcisms (Luke 4:31–37, 40–41; 6:18–19), healing the sick (Luke 4:38–40; 5:12–26; 6:18–19), and announcing the good news of the kingdom (Luke 4:44; 6:20–49). In so doing, he fulfills the release for Israel that Isaiah foretells (Isa 61:1–2; 58:6).⁸⁵ Luke clearly presents Jews as the beneficiaries of this deliverance by having Jesus begin his ministry in Galilee (Luke 4:14), proceed from Nazareth to another Jewish city, Capernaum, and subsequently declare that he must proclaim his message throughout the whole Jewish land (Luke 4:42–44).⁸⁶ When Luke does recount the healing of the servant of a non-Jewish centurion in Luke 7:1–10, however, he casts Jesus in the role of Elisha and likens this event to the intervention of Elisha on behalf of Naaman, a non-Jew.⁸⁷ Luke in this way presents Jesus as the source of salvation for all people who express faith in him,⁸⁸ but he does not equate this inclusiveness with a transfer of scriptural promises from Jews to non-Jews. Instead, he applies scriptural promises originally made to Israel to Jews (Isa 61:1–2; 58:6) but uses stories from the Jewish scriptures that depict the ministry of prophets to people outside of the borders

Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 412; Plummer, *Luke*, 203; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:79–81.

⁸⁵ As David P. Moessner, “The Ironic Fulfillment of Israel’s Glory,” in *Eight Critical Perspectives*, 44, correctly observes, Luke 4:18–20 and 7:22 illustrate how Jesus effects liberation for Israel: “Israel’s consolation is indeed of Israel, by Israel, and for Israel.”

⁸⁶ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:78, notes that the term Ἰουδαία in Luke 4:44 refers to the whole country of the Jews rather than to the more restricted territory of Judea. Luke also uses the term Ἰουδαία to refer more broadly to the land of the Jews in a number of other contexts (Luke 6:17; 7:17; 23:5; Acts 10:37); cf. Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 256; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:557–8.

⁸⁷ The healing of the servant of the Roman centurion in Luke 7:1–10 resembles the healing of Naaman by Elisha (2 Kgs 5:1–14), and the raising of the son of the widow of Nain (Luke 7:11–17) resembles the story of Elijah and the widow in Sidon (1 Kgs 17:17–24; cf. 2 Kgs 4). As Siker, “First to the Gentiles,” 88, notes, the references to Elijah and Elisha in Luke 4:25–27 also correspond to these two episodes in Luke 7.

⁸⁸ Luke has Jesus describe the exemplary faith of the centurion, which seems to be part of the reason for the positive response of Jesus to him (Luke 7:9).

of Israel as models for portraying the ministry of Jesus to non-Jews (2 Kgs 5:1–14).⁸⁹

Descriptions of the inclusion of non-Jews and of the rejection of Jesus by Jews become more explicit in the book of Acts. As discussed in Chapter Four, in Acts 13, Jews become jealous of Paul and Barnabas and so resist their preaching (Acts 13:44–45).⁹⁰ Consequently, Paul and Barnabas declare that they will turn to non-Jews, in fulfillment of Isa 49:6. Despite this description of a transfer of “the word of God” from Jews to non-Jews, Luke does not indicate for this reason that the scriptural promises originally intended for Jews were given to non-Jews. Instead, he casts Paul and Barnabas in the role of the

⁸⁹ Luke later reiterates this perspective when he has Peter allude to Isa 61:1–2, the passage which was cited in Luke 4:16–21. The links between Luke 4:18–19 and Acts 10:36–38 have been well-established. The phrases τὸν λόγον [ὸν] ἀπέστειλεν and εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην in Acts 10:36 correspond to the phrases ἀπέσταλκέν με and εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς in Luke 4:18, and both passages draw upon Isa 61:1. The description of the anointing of Jesus in Acts 10:38 (ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει) recalls the phrase “the Spirit of the Lord is upon me because he has anointed me” (Πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ’ ἐμὲ οὐ εἶνεκεν ἔχρισέν με) from Luke 4:18 (cf. Luke 4:14), and the reference to his healing and deliverance ministry in Acts 10:38 corresponds more generally to his activities in the Gospel of Luke. The connections between Luke 4 and Acts 10 strongly suggest that the latter passage alludes to the former. As such, the speech of Peter provides us with another window on Luke’s understanding of how the ministry of Jesus fulfilled Isa 61:1–2 on behalf of Jews. In Acts 10:36, Peter states explicitly that Jesus proclaimed his message to Israel: “You know the message he sent to the people of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ—he is Lord of all.” Although Peter clearly affirms the universal lordship of Jesus in this context, he pointedly indicates that God sent this message to *Israel* and alludes to his fulfillment of the promises of Isa 61:1–2 for the Jewish people (Acts 10:38). Furthermore, when Luke has Peter describe the scriptural basis for the inclusion of Cornelius and his household, he does not indicate that the promises of Isa 61:1–2 apply to non-Jews. Instead, he explains how the Jewish scriptures foretell the forgiveness of sins for all peoples (Acts 10:43). For further discussion of the narrative links between Luke 4 and Acts 10, see Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, 117; Dupont, *Salvation*, 143, 152, 156; Bock, *Proclamation*, 233; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:140–1; Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 236–7.

⁹⁰ See the full citation of Acts 13:46–47 in Chapter Four. The explicit citation and interpretation of Isa 49:6 in Acts 13:46–47 has generated considerable discussion and scholars often rightly note that this passage plays a pivotal role in Luke’s narrative. Some argue that Luke cites Isa 49:6 to justify the rejection of Jews and the inclusion of non-Jews (e.g., Haenchen, *Acts*, 101; Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 53; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 98–100). Others maintain that Luke cites and interprets Isa 49:6 to present the inclusion of non-Jews as the natural consequence of God’s restoration of Israel (e.g., Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 41–61; David Moessner, “Paul in Acts: Preacher of Eschatological Repentance to Israel,” *NTS* 34 [1988]: 102–3). For further discussion, see Chapter Four.

servant of YHWH, so that they participate in the part of this Isaianic promise that relates to Israel, but indicates that non-Jews receive “the word of God” on the scriptural basis that God had always planned to provide illumination for the nations through the servant of YHWH (Isa 49:6).⁹¹

Furthermore, in the sermon immediately prior to the announcement of Acts 13:46–47, Luke has Paul pointedly describe how Christ fulfilled scriptural promises made to Jews in numerous ways (Acts 13:13–41). In the first place, the introduction to the sermon affirms the elect status of Israel and God’s faithful care for this nation (Acts 13:17). Second, Luke has Paul declare Jesus to be the Davidic messiah who, through his resurrection, fulfilled the scriptural promises made to the Jewish people (Acts 13:33b–41; cf. LXX Ps 2:7; Isa 55:3; Ps 16:10).⁹² Third, in Acts 13:38, Paul indicates that his audience receives forgiveness in fulfillment of God’s promise of salvation to Jews: “Let it be known to you (ὁμῖν) therefore, my brothers, that through this man forgiveness of sins is proclaimed to you (ὁμῖν).” Fourth, throughout his speech in Acts 13:16–41, Paul repeatedly declares how this fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures applies to Jews:

Acts 13:23

τούτου ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος κατ’ ἐπαγγελίαν ἤγαγεν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ σωτῆρα Ἰησοῦν

From the offspring of this one (David) God has brought *to Israel* a Savior, Jesus, according to the promise

⁹¹ Some scholars attempt to argue that Luke presents Christ as the servant of YHWH in Acts 13:46–47. See, e.g., Pierre Grelot, “Note sur Actes, XIII, 47,” *RB* 88 (1981): 368–72; J. Dupont, *Nouvelles études sur les Actes des apôtres* (LD 118; Paris: Cerf, 1984), 345–9. The majority rightly conclude, however, that Acts 13:46–47 applies this role to Paul and Barnabas. See, e.g., Haenchen, *Acts*, 414; Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 41–61; Conzelmann, *Acts*, 106; Marshall, *Acts*, 230; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 100–1. Because the Lukan Paul prefaces his citation of Isa 49:6 with “thus the Lord has commanded us,” it is difficult to read the Isaiah passage as anything but a reference to the missionaries themselves.

⁹² The application of scriptural promises to the Jewish people is especially emphatic in Acts 13:34b where Paul cites LXX Isa 55:3b. Since LXX Isa 55:3b uses the plural pronoun ὁμῖν to describe the recipients of Davidic promises—“I will give you (ὁμῖν) the holy promises made to David”—the citation has the effect of applying the fulfillment of this scriptural passage to the Jewish people as a whole rather than to a single Davidic heir. Darrell L. Bock, *Acts* (ECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 457, maintains that ὁμῖν refers to Jews and proselytes to Judaism in this context; cf. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:171.

Acts 13:26

Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραὰμ καὶ οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν,⁹³ ἡμῖν⁹⁴ ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἐξαπεστάλη.

My brothers, *descendants of the race of Abraham*, and those who fear God among you, *to us* the message of this salvation has been sent

Acts 13:32–33a

καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμεθα τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίαν γενομένην, ὅτι ταύτην ὁ θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκεν τοῖς τέκνοις [αὐτῶν] ἡμῖν⁹⁵

⁹³ This phrase (cf. Acts 13:16—ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν) may refer to both Jews and non-Jewish sympathizers, in which case Luke would be applying scriptural promises made to Jews to the latter group as well. Some commentators argue that Luke uses οἱ φοβούμενοι, together with participle forms of σέβομαι, as a technical or near-technical term that refers to non-Jewish sympathizers to Judaism. See, e.g., J. Andrew Overman, “The God-fearers: Some Neglected Features,” *JSNT* 32 (1988): 21; J. M. Lieu, “The Race of the God-fearers,” *JTS* 43 (1995): 483–4. Yet, as Kirsopp Lake, “Proselytes and God-fearers,” *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles* (ed. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; London: MacMillan, 1920–1933), 5:75–88 and Max Wilcox, “The God-Fearers in Acts: A Reconsideration,” *JSNT* 13 (1981): 102–22, have argued, Luke uses the phrase οἱ φοβούμενοι to refer to pious Jews (Luke 1:50) and pious non-Jews (Acts 10:1, 22, 35); they conclude that Luke did not use the term as a technical designation even though it could, in some contexts, refer to non-Jewish sympathizers to Judaism. In Acts 13:16, οἱ φοβούμενοι may stand in apposition to Ἰσραηλῖται and serve as an adjective of Ἰσραηλῖται, especially since Paul appears to address the whole group as “brothers” (cf. Acts 13:26). Furthermore, the καὶ in Acts 13:26 does not occur in two important manuscripts (P⁴⁵ B). If the reading without καὶ is the original, the entire phrase οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν could stand in apposition to υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραὰμ and function as a description of the especially pious Jews in Paul’s audience. Despite this possibility, a number of commentators suggest that the presence of the phrase ἐν ὑμῖν in Acts 13:26 suggests that οἱ φοβούμενοι refers to a group different from “the descendants of Abraham.” See, e.g., Lake, “Proselytes,” 5:86–87; Haenchen, *Acts*, 409; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:639. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:639, concludes that since Luke has Paul address the entire group in Acts 13:26 as “brothers,” he must intend to portray οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι as full proselytes to Judaism but suggests that if the καὶ represents a later addition, the phrase probably describes the physical descendants of Abraham. These observations lead me to conclude that Luke here uses οἱ φοβούμενοι to refer to Jews or to full proselytes to Judaism. Furthermore, the reading of οἱ φοβούμενοι in Acts 13:26 (cf. 13:16) as a reference to non-Jewish adherents to Judaism is problematic since Luke has Paul describe this sermon as an instance of speaking to Jews first; Acts 13:46 presents turning to non-Jews as a shift in the ministry of Paul and Barnabas. If the missionaries had been preaching to non-Jews already, announcing that they would proclaim their message to non-Jews would not represent a change.

⁹⁴ Note the alternative readings in Acts 13:26b: ἡμῖν (P⁷⁴ ⲁ B D Y 33 81 614 2344^{vid} it^d, sin syr^{hmg} cop^{sa meg}); ὑμῖν (P⁴⁵ C E 36 181 397 453 610 945 1175 1409 1678 1739 1881 Byz [L P] *Lect* it^{ar}, c, dem, e, gig, p, ph, ro, t, w vg syr^{ph} cop^{bo} arm eth geo slav Chrysostom).

⁹⁵ There is only late support for αὐτῶν ἡμῖν (C³ E 33 36 81 181 Byz *pm*) but stronger and earlier support for ἡμῶν (P⁷⁴ ⲁC* D *pc*). In either case, the emphasis rests upon God’s fulfillment of promises for Jews.

And we bring you the good news that the promise which was made to the ancestors, this God has fulfilled *for us, [their] children*

Acts 13:38

γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὅτι διὰ τούτου ὑμῖν ἁφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν καταγγέλλεται

Let it be known to *you* therefore, brothers, that through this man forgiveness of sins is proclaimed to *you*

Luke therefore has Paul pointedly depict his Jewish audience as the heirs of the scriptural promises originally made to Jews even though the narrative will soon demonstrate that a number of Jews ultimately reject the fulfillment that God offers in Jesus. As Tannehill rightly affirms, Luke does not attempt to reduce the tension between his conviction that God fulfilled his promises for Israel and the rejection of these promises.⁹⁶ He does not attempt to mitigate this apparent contradiction by redirecting the scriptural promises made to Jews to a new group of non-Jewish recipients.

Numerous other scenes in Luke-Acts demonstrate a similar type of tension between the affirmation that God fulfilled the promises he made to Jews and the rejection of that salvation by some Jews. For example, in Luke 2:30–32, Simeon expresses the expectation that Israel will experience “glory” as part of the fulfillment of Isa 49:6 (cf. 42:6–7) but also anticipates the “falling and rising of many in Israel” (Luke 2:34–35). Similarly, Luke 3:1–6 declares the fulfillment of a deliverance for Israel that Isa 40:3–5 foretells even as John the Baptist warns that not all Jews will become recipients of this salvation (Luke 3:7–8). Again, at the end of Acts, Paul indicates that he stands on trial because of his hope in the promises that Israel will attain (Acts 26:6–7) and states that he experiences imprisonment because of this hope (Acts 28:20). In this context, however, he also harshly rebukes Jews who reject his message and scriptural interpretation (Acts 28:25–28).⁹⁷ Thus, although Luke indicates that Jews who reject Jesus forfeit the benefits provided by his fulfillment of scriptural promises, he continues to assert that God’s positive intentions for the Jewish people remain firm.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:164–75; cf. idem, “Paul’s Mission,” 87–8.

⁹⁷ Other passages exhibit a similar tension without referring to Isaianic promises. For example, in Acts 2:22–23, Peter indicates that Jews killed Jesus but also emphasizes that God raised Jesus who then sent the Spirit to Jews (cf. Acts 3:15–17, 25–26; 5:30–32).

⁹⁸ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:352–7.

5.4.2 *Isaianic Promises in the Writings of Justin*

Although Justin, like Luke, frequently cites and interprets Isaianic passages to demonstrate how Christ has fulfilled them by bringing light to the nations, he develops his interpretation of these promises in a direction that Luke does not.⁹⁹ By presenting Christ as the new covenant and light of the nations, Justin argues that only those who believe his message practice proper covenant fidelity and so embody the identity of “true Israel.” In this way, Justin attempts to depict non-Jewish Christ-believers as the rightful heirs of the scriptural promises and legacy originally designated for Jews.

Dialogue 10–12

The interpretation of passages from Isaiah in the *Dialogue* is both shaped by and contributes to the wider debate in this text about what proper covenant fidelity entails.¹⁰⁰ In *Dial.* 10.3, Justin introduces his interaction with Trypho by having him express his surprise that Christ-believers do not observe the ritual requirements of the Mosaic law. Trypho argues that such an oversight amounts to scorning the covenant and spurning the commands of God. Accordingly, he doubts that anyone who lives in this way truly knows God: “But you, scorning this covenant rashly...try to convince us that you know God, when

⁹⁹ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 348–53, suggests that Justin relies on two different strata of tradition when interpreting Isaianic promises—one that presents non-Jewish Christ-believers as true Israel (e.g., *Dial.* 123.8–9; 135.3) and another that held the view that non-Jewish Christ-believers form part of the people of God together with Christ-believing Jews (e.g., *Dial.* 121.4–123.2). As Skarsaune notes, however, Justin transforms his source material in *Dial.* 121.4–123.2 in an attempt to prove that Christ-believers are the true descendants of Jacob. Thus, even when Justin relies on traditions that do not attempt to prove that the church was true Israel, he harmonizes them with his own view that Christ-believers replace Jews as the true people of God. See also the interpretation of Isa 42:6–7 (49:6–7) in *Barn.* 14:5–8 and the assertion that Jesus made a covenant with Christ-believers that replaces the Mosaic covenant. This latter source, like Justin, indicates that non-Jews rather than Jews become recipients of the covenant inaugurated by Christ.

¹⁰⁰ Although Justin provides a concentrated discussion of the Mosaic law and presents Christ as the new covenant and law in *Dialogue* 10–47, he frequently returns to this theme throughout the *Dialogue*. Anette Rudolph, “Denn wir sind jenes Volk...”: *Die neue Gottesverehrung in Justins Dialog mit dem Juden Tryphon in historisch-theologischer Sicht* (Studien zur Alten Kirchengeschichte 15; Bonn: Borengässer, 1999), 228, argues that Justin presents a new universal worship of God, which is carried out by all people who believe in Christ, as the religion that the Jewish scriptures always intended for humans to practice. This theme, she argues, runs throughout *Dialogue* 12–108 and is summarized again at its conclusion.

you fail to do those things that every God-fearing person would do" (*Dial.* 10.4). These charges form the basis for Trypho's approach to the Jewish scriptures; in his view, only those who observe the entire Mosaic code have a proper knowledge of God and his covenant.

In response to the concern voiced by Trypho, Justin begins his scriptural interpretation in the *Dialogue* by attempting to demonstrate that Christ-believers have remained faithful to the covenant and Jewish scriptures even though they do not practice the rituals prescribed in the Mosaic law. To prove this, he asserts that Christ's fulfillment of Isaianic and other scriptural promises nullifies the need to follow the Mosaic law as it was promulgated on Horeb:¹⁰¹

Νυνὶ δὲ ἀνέγων γάρ, ὦ Τρύφων, ὅτι ἔσοιτο καὶ τελευταῖος νόμος καὶ διαθήκη κυριωτάτη πασῶν, ἣν νῦν δέον φυλάσσειν πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὅσοι τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ κληρονομίας ἀντιποιοῦνται. Ὁ γὰρ ἐν Χωρὴβ παλαιὸς ἤδη νόμος καὶ ὑμῶν μόνων, ὁ δὲ <καινός> πάντων ἀπλῶς· νόμος δὲ κατὰ νόμου τεθεὶς τὸν πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἔπαυσε, καὶ διαθήκη μετέπειτα γενομένη τὴν προτέραν ὁμοίως ἔστησεν. Αἰώνιός τε ἡμῖν νόμος καὶ τελευταῖος ὁ Χριστὸς ἐδόθη καὶ ἡ διαθήκη πιστή, μεθ' ἣν οὐ νόμος οὐ πρόσταγμα, οὐκ ἐντολή. Ἡ σὺ ταῦτα οὐκ ἀνέγνως ἃ φησιν Ἡσαΐας; Ἀκούσατέ μου, ἀκούσατέ μου, λαὸς μου, καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς πρὸς με ἐνωτίζεσθε, ὅτι νόμος παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ ἡ κρίσις μου εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν. Ἐγγίξει ταχὺ ἡ δικαιοσύνη μου, καὶ ἐξελεύσεται τὸ σωτήριόν μου, καὶ εἰς τὸν βραχίονά μου ἔθνη ἐλπιούσι. Καὶ διὰ Ἱερεμίου περὶ ταύτης αὐτῆς τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης οὕτω φησὶν· Ἴδου ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, λέγει κύριος, καὶ διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰουδα διαθήκην καινὴν, οὐκ ἦν διεθέμην τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἣ ἐπελαβόμην τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν ἐξαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου.

But now, for I have read, O Trypho, that there should be a final law and a covenant, more binding than all, which all humans must now observe, as many as are laying claim to the inheritance of God. For the law (promulgated) at Horeb is already obsolete, and was yours only, but the <new> (law) is plainly for all. Now a law placed against a law brings to an end what was before it; so likewise does a covenant that was later make the former one stop. An everlasting and final law and a trustworthy covenant (Isa 24:5; 55:3), Christ himself, has been given to us, after which there is no law, or precept, or commandment. Or have you not read these things which Isaiah said: "Listen to me, listen to me, my people; and you kings, pay attention to me because a law shall go forth from me, and my judgment as a light of nations. My justice draws near

¹⁰¹ This also forms part of Justin's argument that Christ-believers worship the same God as Jews, an affirmation that probably represents a response to the claims of Marcion (cf. *1 Apol.* 26.5–6; 58.1–2).

swiftly, and my salvation shall go forth, and in my arm the nations shall hope” (Isa 51:4–5)? And concerning this same new covenant, through Jeremiah he thus spoke: “Behold the days are coming, says the Lord, and I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not what I made with their fathers, on the day that I took their hand to bring them out from the land of Egypt” (Jer 31:31–32). (*Dial.* 11.2–3)

Here Justin joins Jer 31:31–32 with Isa 51:4–5 in order to present Christ as both the light of the nations and as a new law and covenant.¹⁰² In so doing, he attempts to show that Christ has instituted a new order that replaces observance of the Mosaic code (*Dial.* 11.2) and to present this new means of covenant fidelity as the proper way to gain access to “the inheritance of God” (*Dial.* 11.2).

In the discussion that follows, Justin aims to display the efficacy of this new order by outlining the pious behavior of non-Jewish Christ-believers:¹⁰³

Εἰ οὖν ὁ θεὸς διαθήκην καινὴν ἐκήρυξε μέλλουσαν διαταχθήσεσθαι καὶ ταύτην εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν, ὁρῶμεν δὲ καὶ πεπεῖσμεθα διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ <ἀνθρώπους> ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἀδικίας προσελθόντας τῷ θεῷ καὶ μέχρι θανάτου ὑπομένοντας τὴν ὁμολογίαν καὶ εὐσέβειαν ποιεῖσθαι, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔργων καὶ ἐκ τῆς παρακολουθούσης δυνάμεως συνιέναι πᾶσι δυνατόν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ καινὸς νόμος καὶ ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη καὶ ἡ προσδοκία τῶν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀναμενόντων τὰ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγαθὰ. Ἰσραηλιτικὸν γὰρ τὸ ἀληθινόν, πνευματικόν, καὶ Ἰούδα γένος καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἀβραάμ, τοῦ ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει μαρτυρηθέντος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εὐλογηθέντος καὶ πατρὸς πολλῶν ἐθνῶν κληθέντος, ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν, οἱ διὰ τούτου τοῦ σταυρωθέντος Χριστοῦ τῷ θεῷ προσαχθέντες, ὥς καὶ προκοπτόντων ἡμῖν τῶν λόγῶν ἀποδειχθήσεται.

¹⁰² See also the reference to and explanation of Christ as a “new covenant” in *Dial.* 122.5. According to Rudolph, “Denn wir sind jenes Volk,” 254, the concept of true Israel begins in *Dial.* 11.3 and controls the concluding section of the *Dialogue*, especially chapters 122–135.

¹⁰³ This description stands in direct contrast to the declaration of Trypho that obeying the Mosaic law represents the universal means of pleasing God. In *Dial.* 10.4, Trypho indicates that performing the Mosaic law is what all those who fear God do whereas, in *Dial.* 11.1–5, Justin indicates that all who wish to become the true people of God must embrace Christ as the new law and covenant. As Kimber Buell, *New Race*, 109–11, observes, “Justin positions Trypho as representing a ‘particular’ way of life, linked to his ancestors (*Dial.* 10.1; 11.1, 3), whereas Justin claims to offer a universal and eternal law for all humans (*Dial.* 11.2, 4)” (110).

If, therefore, God proclaimed a new covenant that was about to be established, and this as a light to nations (Isa 42:6; 49:6), we then see and have been persuaded that, through the name of him who was crucified, Jesus Christ, <people> have turned to God from idolatry and other unrighteousness, and have kept the confession even unto death and practiced piety. Now it is possible for all to understand from these deeds and the accompanying power that he is the new law and the new covenant and the expectation of those from all nations who wait for the good things from God. For we are the true spiritual Israel¹⁰⁴ and race of Judah and Jacob and Isaac and Abraham who—while uncircumcised, was approved and blessed by God, and called the father of many nations because of faith—have been led to God through this crucified Christ, as shall be demonstrated as our discussion progresses.
(*Dial.* 11.4–5)

He explains that the exemplary faith and piety of Christ-believers both demonstrates the ability of Christ to function effectively as the new law and covenant and enables them to become “true spiritual Israel.”¹⁰⁵ For Justin, then, not only has Christ become a light for the nations; he also provides non-Jews with the means of practicing covenant fidelity and therefore of becoming heirs to the heritage and promises that God originally gave to Jews (cf. *Dial.* 123.7–9; 135.3).

Justin also indicates that the preaching of the apostles fulfills the intended function of the Mosaic law insofar as it leads people to turn from idolatry and sin to piety and worship of the true God (*1 Apol.* 39.1–3; *Dial.* 109.1–110.3).¹⁰⁶ Moreover, he describes this proclamation and its results as a “second circumcision.” For example, in *Dialogue* 24, he portrays Christ as the new law that has proceeded from Zion and as the mediator of a new circumcision: “Another covenant and another law have come out of Zion. As was proclaimed of old, Jesus Christ circumcises with knives of stone all those who want it, in order that they may become a righteous nation, a people that keeps the faith, holds

¹⁰⁴ Justin here uses Ἰσραηλιτικόν, a term that may more literally be translated as “Israelitic” (cf. *Dial.* 135.3). See G. W. H. Lampe, ed., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961), 678.

¹⁰⁵ According to Kimber Buell, *New Race*, 98–115, Justin identifies Christ-believers as true Israel, in part, by redefining membership within this group in terms of belief and practice, and contrasting these beliefs and practices with circumcision and adherence to other aspects of Mosaic law.

¹⁰⁶ For citation and further discussion of these passages, see Chapter Four.

to the truth, and maintains peace" (*Dial.* 24.1–2).¹⁰⁷ Subsequently, in *Dialogue* 113–114, Justin explains that this second circumcision was administered through the preaching of the apostles: "But our circumcision . . . circumcises us . . . by means of sharp stones, namely, by means of the words proclaimed by the apostles" (*Dial.* 114.4).¹⁰⁸ By presenting the message of the apostles as a proclamation of a new law from Zion Justin shows their preaching and scriptural interpretation, and its positive reception, to be the fulfillment of Isaianic promises. Beyond simply receiving the illumination that Isaiah foretells, however, non-Jews who believe their message receive a second circumcision and thereby gain access to a form of covenant fidelity that replaces observance of the Mosaic law.

Dialogue 121–123

In the section of the *Dialogue* that Justin devotes to a description of the true people of God (109–40), he reiterates that Christ became the new covenant and law and so provides illumination for the nations (cf. Isa 49:6; 42:6–7).¹⁰⁹ As in the beginning of his discussion with Trypho, Justin again states that the repentance, faith, and piety of Christ-believers represents the new way of being faithful to the Jewish scriptures and the God of Israel (*Dial.* 121.1–4; cf. *Dial.* 11.4; 12.1–3; 14.2–3).¹¹⁰ He characterizes Christ-believers as those "who obey the precepts of Christ" (*Dial.* 123.9) and argues that this obedience

¹⁰⁷ The phrases "as was proclaimed of old" and "knives of stone" allude to the second circumcision that Joshua administered before the Israelites entered the land of Canaan (Josh 5:2).

¹⁰⁸ Justin also contrasts the "true" or "second" circumcision of Christ-believers with physical circumcision (e.g., *Dial.* 28.3–5; 43.1–2; 92.2–4; 114.4; 137.1–2), and maintains that the latter type was administered because of the hardness of the hearts of the Jewish people (*Dial.* 18.2–3; 27.2; 43.1; 45.3; 46.5, 7; 47.2; 61.4, 10; 114.4).

¹⁰⁹ See further discussion of *Dialogue* 121–3 in Chapter Four.

¹¹⁰ As Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 360–3, notes, Justin presents Christ as the new law because, in his view, "he accomplishes the most important function of the Law . . . He turns men from idolatry and iniquity to worship of God and a pious life" (363). According to Skarsaune, Justin argues that the piety of Christ-believers finds expression in their refusal to practice idolatry (*Dial.* 18.2–3; 110.2–4) which, in Justin's view, stands in contrast to a Jewish hardness and proneness to idolatry (e.g., *Dial.* 34.7–8; 46.6; 92.3–4; 93.1–4; 130.4; 131.2). Justin also presents the piety and repentance of Christ-believers as the observance of a new Sabbath and the circumcision of the heart as the replacement of observance of the ritual requirements of the Mosaic law (e.g., *Dial.* 12.3; 14.3; 18.2; 24.1–2; 26.1; 28.2–3; 43.1–2; 92.4; 113.1–114.5).

represents proper covenant fidelity.¹¹¹ Whereas Trypho and other Jews purport to bring light to their proselytes through their interpretation of the Mosaic law, Justin concludes that they could not possibly provide illumination for non-Jews because they fail to comprehend the true intent of the law (*Dial.* 123.2–3; cf. Isa 29:14). They neither teach nor embody covenant faithfulness because they do not recognize how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures (*Dial.* 122.1–6; cf. *Dial.* 11.4–5; 12.1–3).

Finally, in *Dialogue* 123, Justin concludes his exposition of Isa 49:6 and 42:6–7 by providing the natural corollary of his presentation of Christ as the new covenant and law: those who receive enlightenment through him become the true people of God. In this passage, he joins three citations—Jer 31:27, Isa 19:24–25, and Ezek 36:12—in order to argue that God has raised up another Israel in the place of Jews, who have misunderstood the will and covenant of God:

Τοιγαροῦν· Σπερῶ, φησί <κύριος>, τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τῷ Ἰουδα σπέρμα ἀνθρώπων καὶ σπέρμα κτηνῶν. Καὶ διὰ Ἡσαίου περὶ ἄλλου Ἰσραὴλ οὕτω φησί· Τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἔσται τρίτος Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τοῖς Ἀσσυρίοις καὶ Αἰγυπτίοις, εὐλογημένος ἐν τῇ γῇ, ἣν εὐλόγησε κύριος Σαβαὼθ λέγων· Εὐλογημένος ἔσται ὁ λαός μου ὁ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ὁ ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις, καὶ ἡ κληρονομία μου Ἰσραὴλ. Εὐλογοῦντος οὖν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦτον τὸν λαὸν καλοῦντος καὶ κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ βοῶντος εἶναι, πῶς οὐ μετανοεῖτε ἐπὶ τε τῷ ἑαυτοὺς ἀπατᾶν, ὥς μόνοι Ἰσραὴλ ὄντες, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ καταρᾶσθαι τὸν εὐλογημένον τοῦ θεοῦ λαόν; Καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρὸς τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ τὰς πέριξ αὐτῆς ἔλεγε χώρας, οὕτω πάλιν ἐπεῖπε· Καὶ γεννήσω ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀνθρώπους, τὸν λαὸν μου Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ κληρονομήσουσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἔσεσθε αὐτοῖς εἰς κατάσχεσιν· καὶ οὐ μὴ προστεθῇτε ἔτι ἀτεκνωθῆναι ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

Therefore <the Lord> says: “I will raise up for Israel and Judah a seed of humans and a seed of beasts” (Jer 31:27). And through Isaiah he speaks thus about another Israel: “In that day Israel shall be third among the Assyrians and Egyptians, blessed in the land that the Lord of Hosts shall bless, saying: ‘Blessed shall be my people who are in Egypt, and who are among the Assyrians, and my inheritance, Israel’” (Isaiah 19:24–25). Therefore, since God blesses and calls this people Israel, and cries aloud

¹¹¹ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 363, argues that these descriptions of the piety and obedience of Christ-believers demonstrate that Christ-believers keep all the requirements of the law except the ritual commandments. He notes that the terms εὐσέβεια, θεοσέβεια and their cognates are often used in Hellenistic Jewish writings (especially 4 Maccabees and Josephus) to describe law-abiding Jews and suggests that Justin uses these terms to depict Christ-believers in a similar way (see, e.g., *Dial.* 11.4; 47.5; 91.3; 93.2; 110.2–3; 131.2).

that it is his inheritance, why do you not repent for deceiving yourselves as if you alone are Israel and for cursing the people who are blessed by God. For even when he was speaking to Jerusalem and its surrounding region, he again added thus: "And I will beget people to you, my people Israel, and they shall inherit you, and you shall be as a possession for them, and you shall no longer be bereaved of them" (Ezek 36:12). (*Dial.* 123.5–6)

Although the precise meaning of this passage is not entirely clear,¹¹² Trypho's subsequent question elucidates the intent of Justin's argument: "Are you Israel and does he speak these things about you?" (*Dial.* 123.7). In response to this question, Justin provides an interpretation of Isa 42:1–4 that aims to demonstrate that those who have been illuminated by Christ become true Israel:¹¹³

Πάλιν, ἔλεγον ἐγώ, ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα, ὡσὶν ἀκούοντες εἰ ἄρα ἀκούετε, περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγων ὁ θεὸς ἐν παραβολῇ Ἰακώβ αὐτὸν καλεῖ καὶ Ἰσραήλ. Οὕτω <δὲ> λέγει· Ἰακώβ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ· Ἰσραήλ <ὁ> ἐκλεκτός μου, <προσδέξεται αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχὴ μου>· θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει.... καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἐλπιούσιν ἔθνη. Ὡς οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνὸς Ἰακώβ ἐκείνου, τοῦ καὶ Ἰσραήλ ἐπικληθέντος, τὸ πᾶν γένος ὑμῶν προσηγόρευτο Ἰακώβ καὶ Ἰσραήλ, οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ γεννήσαντος ἡμᾶς εἰς θεὸν Χριστοῦ, ὡς καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ Ἰσραήλ καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Δαυίδ, καὶ θεοῦ τέκνα ἀληθινὰ καλούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν, οἱ τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ Χριστοῦ φυλάσσοντες.

Again, I said, in Isaiah, if you have ears to hear, God, speaking about Christ in a parable, calls him Jacob and Israel. <And> thus he says: "Jacob is my servant, I will help him; Israel is my elect, <My soul will accept him>. I will place my Spirit upon him, and he shall bring forth justice for the nations.... and in his name the nations shall hope" (Isa 42:1–4).¹¹⁴ Therefore, as from that one person Jacob, who was also

¹¹² Commenting on Justin's use of Jer 31:27, Prigent, *l'Ancien Testament*, 296, suggests that Justin depicts a division of the Jewish people: "Notre auteur entend évidemment qu'Israël va se scinder en deux: les chrétiens sont la descendance humaine, les bêtes ce sont les juifs"; cf. Isa 1:2–4 in *1 Apol.* 37.1–2. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 351, rightly argues that Justin intends Isa 19:24–25 to refer to an "Israel" that does not consist of Jews. He also argues that the reference to Ezek 36:12 ought to be interpreted in light of the use of Isa 65:9 in *Dial.* 136.2. This latter passage implies a rejection of Israel and the inheritance of another "seed of Jacob."

¹¹³ Cf. *Dial.* 125.3–5, where Justin argues that the name Israel referred to the pre-existent Christ who blessed Jacob by giving him his own name. See also *Dial.* 134.6 where Justin repeats that "Israel has been demonstrated to be the Christ."

¹¹⁴ Regarding the two different versions of Isa 42:1–4 that Justin quotes in *Dial.* 123.8–9 and 135.1–3, and their relative dependence upon Matt 12:18b–20a, see Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 60–1; cf. Prigent, *l'Ancien Testament*, 297–8. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 187–8, also notes that the allusions to Jer 31:27 and Ezek 36:12

surnamed Israel, your whole race has been designated Jacob and Israel, so also we, from Christ who begot us to God, are called and are true children of God, as Jacob and Israel and Judah and Joseph and David, and are those who keep the commandments of Christ.
(*Dial.* 123.8–9)

Earlier, in *Dial.* 122.1–123.4, Justin argues that Isa 42:6–7 refers to Christ as the new covenant and law, but in *Dial.* 123.8–9 he asserts that Isa 42:1–4 refers to Christ as Israel. Since Christ is Israel, he deduces, those who are begotten by Christ and keep his commandments partake of this identity too.¹¹⁵ Thus, for Justin, non-Jews who believe in Jesus not only experience the illumination of the nations that Isaiah promises; they also become true Israel because they are descendants of Christ.¹¹⁶

Summary

Both Luke and Justin appeal to Isaianic promises to indicate that the correct understanding of the scriptures, and message of God, represents the realization of a promised end-time illumination but they develop their explanations of how Christ-believers become the recipients of this type of promise in different ways. Luke presents Jewish Christ-believers as recipients of Isaianic promises related to the restoration of Israel and non-Jews as recipients of the promised enlightenment of the nations. Even when he describes a contrast between Jews who reject the message of Jesus and non-Jews who accept it, Luke does not portray non-Jews as the recipients of scriptural promises originally made to Jews. By way of contrast, Justin indicates that Christ and his message bring about the promised illumination of the nations because they fulfill the intended function of the Mosaic law. Through their

(*Dial.* 123.5–6) recur in *Dial.* 135.4–136.2, a passage that focuses on the exegesis of Isa 65:8–12 and attempts to demonstrate that Christ-believers are the legitimate seed of Jacob.

¹¹⁵ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 187–8, 349–53, correctly points out that a number of translations overlook the *ὥς* that introduces the phrase *ὥς καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Δαβὶδ* (*Dial.* 123.9) and notes that this passage does not say explicitly that Christ-believers are Israel. The passage nevertheless strongly implies this by indicating that Christ-believers have attained the same status as Jacob and Israel. Note also that Justin elsewhere explicitly identifies Christ-believers as “the true Israelite race” (*Dial.* 135.3; cf. 11.5).

¹¹⁶ In *Dial.* 135.1–3, Justin also cites Isa 42:1–4 as part of his argument that “Jacob” and “Israel” in this passage refer to Christ and Christ-believers: “Therefore, as he calls Christ Israel and Jacob, so we, who have been hewn out of the side of Christ, are the true Israelite race” (*Dial.* 135.3).

faith in Christ, non-Jewish Christ-believers practice proper covenant fidelity and so become the rightful heirs of the identity and scriptural heritage of Israel.

5.5 THE PROMISE OF THE SPIRIT

In the same way that Luke and Justin portray repentance and correct understanding of the scriptures as defining characteristics of Christ-believers, so they present the Spirit as an endowment that all who believe in Jesus possess.¹¹⁷ Furthermore, both also depict the gift(s) of the Spirit as the realization of scriptural promises. Nevertheless, whereas Luke presents the descent of the Spirit upon Jews and non-Jews as the fulfillment of scriptural promises for Israel and the nations, respectively, Justin depicts a transfer of the Spirit from the Jewish people to non-Jews.¹¹⁸

5.5.1 *The Promise of the Spirit in Luke-Acts*

For Luke, as we have seen, the activity of the Spirit empowers Jesus to function as the agent through whom God's promises for the Jewish people are realized (Luke 4:16–21). Like Matthew and Mark, Luke reports that the Spirit descended upon Jesus at his baptism and in this context alludes to scriptural passages in order to portray him as the Spirit-anointed messiah, or prophetic deliverer, of Israel (Luke 3:21–22; cf. Mark 1:9–11; Matt 3:13–17).¹¹⁹ Yet Luke also highlights

¹¹⁷ For both authors, moreover, the Spirit also enables Christ-believers to understand and proclaim the correct interpretation of the Jewish scriptures. For example, Luke indicates that the disciples would become witnesses to how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures after the Holy Spirit came upon them (Luke 24:48–49; cf. Acts 1:8). Similarly, Justin indicates that no one can understand God apart from the Holy Spirit (*Dial.* 4.1) and that the Jewish prophets spoke by the inspiration of the Spirit (*Dial.* 7.1).

¹¹⁸ Throughout this section, I draw upon some of the ideas that I discuss in “Interpreting the Descent of the Spirit: A Comparison of Justin’s *Dialogue with Trypho* and Luke-Acts,” in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds* (ed. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 95–103.

¹¹⁹ Bock, *Proclamation*, 99–104, notes the numerous scholarly perspectives regarding the possible allusions to passages from the Jewish scriptures in Luke 3:22 (e.g., Ps 2:7, Isa 42, Gen 22, Ex 4:22–23, Isa 41:8, 42:1, and 44:2 together; or Ps 2:7, Isa 41:8, and 42:1 together) but rightly concludes that no single allusion is clearly present. For further discussion of possible scriptural allusions in Luke 3:22, see Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (SP 3; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991), 69–70; Tannehill,

the activity of the Spirit more than the other synoptic gospel writers do by reiterating that Jesus was filled with the Spirit (Luke 4:1), indicating that Jesus returned from his wilderness experience “in the power of the Spirit” (Luke 4:14),¹²⁰ and having Jesus declare that the Spirit empowered him to announce and effect a long-awaited Jubilee release of God’s people (Luke 4:16–31; cf. Isa 61:1–2; 58:6; Lev 25:8–12).¹²¹

At the end of his gospel and in the opening chapters of Acts, Luke depicts the descent of the Spirit upon the disciples as a continuation of the work of the Spirit that began with Jesus (Acts 1:5; cf. Luke 3:16), and as the further realization of scriptural promises for Jews. In this context, Luke has Jesus tell the disciples that he will send “the promise of the Father” upon them. He instructs them to wait “until you are clothed with power from on high” (ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν), a phrase that recalls LXX Isa 32:15 (ἕως ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ἅπ’ ὑψηλοῦ) and refers to the imminent outpouring of the Spirit (Luke 24:49).¹²² Similarly, in Acts 1:4–8, the Lukan Jesus tells the disciples to wait in Jerusalem “for the promise of the Father” (Acts 1:5), refers to this gift as the descent of the Spirit (Acts 1:5; cf. Luke 3:16), and associates the empowerment of the Spirit with the fulfillment of Isa 49:6 (Acts 1:8). For Luke, the descent of the Spirit upon the disciples represents part of the fulfillment of God’s promises to restore the Jewish people.¹²³ In the words of Darrell Bock, “the Spirit’s

Narrative Unity, 1:62–3; Nolland, *Luke*, 1:160–5; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:485–6. Note also that Luke 3:15–18, Mark 1:7–8, and Matt 3:11–12 all indicate that Jesus himself would baptize the people of God with the Holy Spirit. In accordance with the double tradition, Matthew and Luke further report that John the Baptist announces that Jesus will baptize with the Holy Spirit and with fire.

¹²⁰ Compare Mark 1:14a and Matt 4:12. Also, when Peter later recounts the ministry of Jesus, he does so by explaining how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and power (Acts 10:38).

¹²¹ Compare Mark 6:1–6a and Matt 13:53–58. Luke also reports that power (presumably from the Spirit) goes out of Jesus and heals people (Luke 5:17; 6:19; 8:46; compare Mark 3:10 and Matt 9:21; 14:36).

¹²² Marshall, *Luke*, 907; idem, *Acts*, 58; Bock, *Luke*, 2:1942; Nolland, *Luke*, 3:1220; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1585; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 92. Note also that Luke elsewhere frequently links power with the Spirit (Luke 1:17, 35; 4:14; Acts 1:5, 8; 6:8; 10:38).

¹²³ In his discussion of the references to the “promise of the Spirit” (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4; 2:33), Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 259, argues that Luke probably has a number of texts from the Jewish scriptures in mind when he refers to the Spirit as “the promise of the Father” (LXX Joel 3:1–2; Isa 32:15; 44:3; Ezek 11:19; 36:26–37; 37:14); cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 907. Nolland, *Luke*, 3:1220–1, also suggests that Luke probably echoes infancy material in Luke 24:49 and anticipates the fulfillment of the covenant promises that were earlier mentioned (Luke 1:54–55, 70, 72–73). Johnson, *Luke*, 403, maintains that Luke associates “the promise of the Spirit” with Abraham (Acts 2:39; 3:24–26; 13:32;

coming represents the inauguration of the kingdom blessing promised by the Father in the OT.”¹²⁴

In an even more pointed way, on the day of Pentecost, the Lukan Peter indicates that the first outpouring of the Spirit upon the disciples represents the dawning of the eschatological age and the fulfillment of scriptural promises for Jews:

Σταθεῖς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος σὺν τοῖς ἑνδεκά ἐπήρεν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπεφθέγγετο αὐτοῖς, Ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ἱερουσαλὴμ πάντες, τοῦτο ὑμῖν γνωστὸν ἔστω καὶ ἐνωτίσασθε τὰ ῥήματά μου. οὐ γὰρ ὡς ὑμεῖς ὑπολαμβάνετε οὗτοι μεθύουσιν, ἔστιν γὰρ ὥρα τρίτη τῆς ἡμέρας, ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ. Καὶ ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, λέγει ὁ θεός, ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὁράσεις ὄψονται καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνίοις ἐνυπνιασθήσονται· καὶ γε ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν. καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω, αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ· ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα, πρὶν ἔλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῇ. καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσεται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται.

But Peter, standing with the eleven, raised his voice and declared to them, “Men of Judea and all you who live in Jerusalem, let this be known to you, and pay attention to my words. For these men are not drunk, as you suppose, since it is only the third hour of the day; but this is what was spoken through the prophet Joel: ‘And it shall be in the last days, God says, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; even upon my slaves, both men and women, I will pour out my Spirit in those days; and they shall prophesy.’¹²⁵ And I will show portents in the heaven above and signs on the earth below, blood, and fire, and vapor of smoke. The sun shall

26:6). Robert F. O’Toole, “Acts 2:30 and the Davidic Covenant of Pentecost,” *JBL* 102 (1983): 245–58, argues that Luke sees all of the promises of God as one promise that relates to his intervention on behalf of Israel.

¹²⁴ Bock, *Luke*, 2:1943.

¹²⁵ The phrase καὶ προφητεύσουσιν at the end of Acts 2:18 does not occur in LXX Joel 3:2. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 253, suggests that Luke added this phrase to associate the gift of the Spirit with prophetic utterance and to link it to the inspired speech described in Acts 2:4. He also suggests that the phrase is omitted in D and the *Vetus Latina* because of haplography but notes the argument of P. R. Rogers, “Acts 2:18, *kai propheteusousin*” *JTS* 38 (1987): 95–7, that the version with the phrase omitted is more original. For further discussion of the addition of this phrase and Luke’s presentation of the gift of the Spirit in Acts as a prophetic empowerment, see Max Turner, *Power from*

be turned to darkness and the moon to blood, before the coming of the great and glorious day of the Lord. And it shall be that everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved.”
(Acts 2:14–21; cf. LXX Joel 3:1–4)

By exchanging the phrase μετὰ ταῦτα in LXX Joel 3:1 for ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις in Acts 2:17,¹²⁶ Luke depicts the descent of the Spirit as an end-time phenomenon in which all members of the Jewish nation—the young and old, slaves and free, men and women—would participate. Subsequently, in Acts 2:39a, Luke reiterates that the Jewish people would receive the promise of the Spirit by having Peter state: “the promise is for you and for your children.”¹²⁷ Both the Jewish audience of Peter and later generations of Jews were intended recipients of this gift.

Luke also attributes the descent of the Spirit to the fulfillment of Davidic promises. In Acts 2:33, the Lukan Peter explains that Jesus poured out the Spirit after he was exalted to the right hand of the Father: “Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God, and

on High: *The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness* (JPTSup 9; Sheffield: SAP, 1996), 270–2, 352–6.

¹²⁶ Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 158, suggests that the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις alludes to Isa 2:2; cf. Bruce, *Acts*, 121. A number of scholars suggest that this phrase gives the entire citation from LXX Joel 3 an eschatological orientation. See, e.g., Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 252; Marshall, *Acts*, 73; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:136; Johnson, *Acts*, 49; Carroll, *End of History*, 132. Haenchen, *Acts*, 179, argues that μετὰ ταῦτα is the original form of the citation (found in manuscripts B and 076) and concludes that this phrase is most consistent with Lukan theology; cf. idem, “Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte,” *ZTK* 51 (1954): 162. Others suggest that the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις corresponds to post-apostolic thought and therefore should not be considered as Lukan. See, e.g., Rese, *Alttestamentlich Motive*, 51–2; cf. Traugott Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas* (TU 104; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968), 7–8.

¹²⁷ The repetition of ἡ ἐπαγγελία in Acts 2:39 links this statement with the earlier references to the promise of the Holy Spirit (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4–5; 2:33). So Bock, *Acts*, 144. As Barrett, *Acts*, 1:155, notes, the reference to ἡ ἐπαγγελία may also refer more widely to God's covenant with his people and his faithfulness to it; cf. Bruce, *Acts*, 130. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 266, also suggests that Acts 2:39 may refer to the promise that God would give his Spirit to his people in a new sense (e.g., Ezek 36:26–27; 37:14). Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 231–2, argues that Luke intentionally excludes the part of LXX Joel 3:5 that refers to the restoration of Zion and Jerusalem in order to emphasize the inclusion of non-Jews. The citation of LXX Joel 3:5 in Acts 2:39, however, removes the phrase “those who are on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem” and replaces it with the phrase “you and your children, and all those who are far off.” In other words, Luke does not remove the emphasis upon the fulfillment of LXX Joel 3:1–5 for Jews but rephrases the prophecy so that it applies to the Jewish audience of Peter in a specific way.

having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured out this that you both see and hear" (Acts 2:33), a description that links the enthronement of Christ with the outpouring of the Spirit that Peter has already explained in Acts 2:14–21.¹²⁸ In this context, Peter further declares that God raised Jesus from the dead in fulfillment of promises made regarding a Davidic messiah (Acts 2:23–32; cf. LXX Ps 15:8–11; 131:11; 2 Sam 7:12–13) and identifies Jesus as "the Lord" about whom LXX Ps 109:1 speaks (Acts 2:34–35).¹²⁹ Luke thus has Peter demonstrate from scripture that God exalted Jesus as the Davidic Lord and Christ (cf. Acts 2:36).¹³⁰ From his position as king of the "whole house of Israel" (Acts 2:36), Jesus fulfills the promises of scripture by pouring out "the promise of the Spirit" (Acts 2:33; cf. Luke 3:16; 24:49; Acts 1:4–5) upon the Jewish people.¹³¹

Besides presenting the descent of the Spirit as the fulfillment of scriptural promises for Jews, Luke appears to foreshadow the bestowal of the Spirit upon all peoples. For example, in Acts 2:17, he has Peter

¹²⁸ The repetition of the verb ἐκχέω in Acts 2:17, 18, and 33 also has the effect of linking the Joel 3 citation with the latter description of the role of Jesus; by sending the Spirit, he is the agent who causes the fulfillment of LXX Joel 3:1–5. Bock, *Acts*, 113, 131; G. D. Kilgallen, "A Rhetorical and Source-traditions Study of Acts 2,33," *Bib* 77 (1996): 195–6; Johnson, *Acts*, 52, 55; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:150. Moreover, by presenting Jesus as κύριος in Acts 2:34–36, the Lukan Peter identifies the risen and exalted Christ as the "Lord" upon whom people should call for salvation (Acts 2:21; cf. LXX Joel 3:5a). As Kilgallen, "Acts 2, 33," 189, concludes, Acts 2:21 shows that calling on the name of the Lord leads to salvation and Acts 2:36 shows the identity of the Lord upon whom everyone should call; cf. Bock, *Acts*, 135.

¹²⁹ Note the reference to the position of Jesus at the right hand of God in both Acts 2:33 and in the citation of LXX Ps 109:1 in Acts 2:34. Turner, *Power*, 273–5, suggests that Acts 2:25–32 establishes that Jesus is the Davidic heir because of his resurrection (on the basis of LXX Psalm 15) and Acts 2:33–35 establishes that Jesus is David's Lord because of his exaltation to the right hand of God; cf. Kilgallen, "Acts 2,33," 186–7; Bock, *Proclamation*, 181–6.

¹³⁰ Wilckens, *Die Missionreden*, 171–5, interprets the declaration that God made Jesus both Lord and Christ as an adoptionist affirmation; cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:152. Other scholars rightly argue, however, that in the context of Acts 2:14–42, the statement in Acts 2:36 functions as a description of how the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus establishes him in the roles of Lord and Messiah in fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures. So Bock, *Proclamation*, 185–6; cf. Conzelmann, *Acts*, 21; J. Dupont, "Assis à la Droite de Dieu," in *Nouvelles Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*, 249.

¹³¹ Eric Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1975), 39, asserts that Acts 2:36 indicates that Jesus has been enthroned as Lord and Messiah for Israel, to fulfill all the promises made to it; cf. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:40, who concludes that Luke portrays the messianic reign of Jesus as the promised era of salvation for Israel in which Jesus, as Davidic messiah and king, mediates the blessings of God's reign.

declare that, in fulfillment of the words of the prophet Joel, God would pour out his Spirit “upon all flesh” (Acts 2:17; cf. LXX Joel 3:1) and that “everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved” (Acts 2:21; cf. LXX Joel 3:5a). Again, in Acts 2:39b, the Lukan Peter alludes to Joel 3:5b in his announcement that the Spirit and forgiveness of sins would also benefit “all who are far away, everyone whom the Lord our God calls to him” (Acts 2:39b; cf. LXX Joel 3:5b; Isa 57:19).¹³² Although these references do not clearly indicate that non-Jews would receive the Spirit, a number of commentators conclude that Luke alludes to LXX Joel 3:5b in Acts 2:39b, together with Isa 57:19 (τοῖς μακράν), in order to affirm the inclusion of all peoples.¹³³ If this is Luke’s intention, his use of LXX Joel 3 surely departs from its original context, which describes eschatological blessing for Israel and punishment for the nations (Joel 3–4). Even in this instance, however, Luke does not transform LXX Joel 3:1–5 so as to apply promises originally made to Jews to non-Jews. Instead, he uses this passage to emphasize that God has acted to restore the Jewish people while concomitantly using its references to the nations to foreshadow the inclusion of non-Jews into the Christ-believing community.

When Luke turns to an explicit narration of the inclusion of the first non-Jews, he attempts to demonstrate their full acceptance by God, in part, by presenting the first descent of the Spirit upon this group as an experience equivalent to the first descent of the Spirit upon Jewish disciples.¹³⁴ Indeed, the numerous connections that Luke draws between

¹³² Compare Acts 2:39b (πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακράν ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσῃται κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν) with LXX Joel 3:5b (οὗς κύριος προσκέκληται).

¹³³ See, e.g., Carroll, *End of History*, 131; cf. Rese, *Alttestamentlich Motive*, 50; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:155–6; Johnson, *Acts*, 58; Dupont, *Salvation*, 22–3; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 231; Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 58. The phrase πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακράν in Acts 2:39, however, may refer to non-Jews, Diaspora Jews, or future generations of Jews; i.e., it could have an ethnic, spatial, or temporal connotation. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 266–7, suggests that Diaspora Jews may be in view in this passage but, in the context of the wider narrative, a reference to non-Jews is probable. Haenchen, *Acts*, 184, asserts that μακράν in this context is spatial (Diaspora Jews) and that the audience of Peter would not have understood this as a reference to non-Jews; cf. Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 156; Denova, *Things Accomplished*, 167–75. Bruce, *Acts*, 130, suggests that μακράν in Acts 2:39 refers to three different types of groups: distant generations, Diaspora Jews, and non-Jews.

¹³⁴ Although some would identify the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch as the first conversion of a non-Jew, Luke presents the conversion of Cornelius and his household as the first inclusion of non-Jews (Acts 15:14). For further discussion, see Chapter Four.

the two episodes (Acts 2 and 10–11) lead a number of scholars to conclude that Luke portrays the descent of the Spirit upon Cornelius and his household as a “Gentile Pentecost.”¹³⁵ He describes the effects of the outpouring of the Spirit as inspired speech in a manner that recalls the Pentecost experience (Acts 10:46),¹³⁶ and indicates that Cornelius and his household received “the same gift of the Holy Spirit” that the first disciples received (Acts 10:45; cf. 11:17).¹³⁷ Furthermore, Luke has Peter voice the following conclusions about this event: “these people . . . have received the Holy Spirit just as we have” (Acts 10:47),¹³⁸ “the Holy Spirit fell upon them just as it had upon us at the beginning” (Acts 11:15; cf. 15:8), and “God . . . testified to them by giving them the Holy Spirit, just as he did to us” (Acts 15:8). Within Luke’s story, these descriptions of the action of the Spirit upon non-Jews serve to legitimate their entrance to the Christ-believing group; that the Spirit descended upon non-Jewish Christ-believers in the same way as it did upon Jewish Christ-believers verifies that the equal inclusion of the former group occurred at God’s initiative (Acts 10:47–48; 11:17; 15:8). Luke thus establishes the experience of the Spirit as part of the new basis for membership within the Christ-believing community.¹³⁹

Although Luke clearly presents the first descents of the Spirit upon Jews and non-Jews as parallel episodes (Acts 2 and 10), he does not

¹³⁵ E.g., Witherington, *Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 360; John B. Polhill, *Acts* (NTC 26; Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 264; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 460, 472; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:142–3; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:535.

¹³⁶ Compare λαλούντων γλώσσαις καὶ μεγαλυνόντων τὸν θεόν in Acts 10:46 with ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις in Acts 2:4 and λαλούντων αὐτῶν ταῖς ἡμετέραις γλώσσαις τὰ μεγαλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in Acts 2:11. Note also the repetition of the term ἐκχέω in Acts 2:17, 18, 33, and Acts 10:45. Elsewhere in Acts, the term occurs only once in reference to the shedding of the blood of Stephen (Acts 22:20).

¹³⁷ Compare ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος in Acts 10:45 and δωρεάν in Acts 11:17 with τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος in Acts 2:38. Witherington, *Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 364, maintains that these references to “the gift” equate the descent of the Spirit upon the first non-Jewish Christ-believers with the experience of the apostles in Acts 2:1–4.

¹³⁸ Johnson, *Acts*, 194, suggests that the phrase ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς in Acts 10:47 is the key premise which demonstrates the common experience of the Spirit by the disciples in Acts 2 and the new believers in Acts 10. Witherington, *Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 360, argues that the phrase does not necessarily mean that the phenomenon of tongues was identical in both Acts 2 and 10, but only that the same *Spirit* was received. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:116, also maintains that the inspired speech may have had different forms.

¹³⁹ Johnson, *Acts*, 198; Witherington, *Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 360–1; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:494–5, 533–4; Bruce, *Acts*, 264, 270. Peter views the descent of the Spirit upon Cornelius and his household as evidence that he should affirm their full inclusion in the Christ-believing community through baptism (Acts 10:47–48).

use the same scriptural passages to portray these two events as the fulfillment of God's plan. In Acts 2, he presents the descent of the Spirit upon Jews as the fulfillment of scriptural promises for Israel (LXX Joel 3:1–5; Ps 15:8–11; 131:11; 2 Sam 7:12–13) but, in the context of the Apostolic council in Acts 15, he depicts the descent of the Spirit upon Cornelius and his household as the realization of God's promise to enable non-Jews to seek him:

Συμεὼν ἐξηγήσατο καθὼς πρῶτον ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἔθνων λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. καὶ τούτῳ συμφωνοῦσιν οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν καθὼς γέγραπται, Μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν,¹⁴⁰ ὥπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς, λέγει κύριος ποιῶν ταῦτα γνωστὰ ἅπ' αἰῶνος.

Simeon has related how God first visited the nations, to take from them a people for his name. With this the words of the prophets agree, as it is written, "After these things I will return, and I will rebuild the tent of David, which has fallen. And I will rebuild its ruins, and I will restore it, in order that the rest of humankind may seek the Lord—even all the nations over whom my name has been called, says the Lord, who makes these things known from long ago."¹⁴¹ (Acts 15:14–18)

This passage describes a Davidic restoration, even as Acts 2 also does (Acts 2:22–36). Here, however, Luke has James cite and interpret LXX Amos 9:11–12, a text that anticipates both the rebuilding of "the tent of David" (ἡ σκηνὴ Δαυὶδ) and the resulting inclusion of non-Jews in God's end-time salvation.¹⁴²

¹⁴⁰ Compare ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν (Acts 15:16) with ἀναστήσω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτήν (LXX Amos 9:11).

¹⁴¹ Lake and Cadbury, *Beginnings*, 4:176, suggest that the variations in the citation of LXX Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15:15–18 are small and insignificant, but others attribute a number of these changes to allusions to other scriptural passages and to the theological concerns of Luke. For further discussion of the adaptations to the LXX Amos 9:11–12 citation, and their significance, see Jostein Ådna, "James' Position at the Summit Meeting of the Apostles and Elders," in *The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles* (WUNT 127; eds. Jostein Ådna and Hans Kvalbein; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2000), 133–6; Richard Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13–21)" in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed. Ben Witherington III; Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 157.

¹⁴² Compare the MT of Amos 9:12 which depicts the subjugation, rather than the inclusion, of non-Jews (למען ירשו את־שארית אדם וכל־הגוים אשר־נקרא שמי) (עליהם נאס־יהוה עשה זאת) with the LXX (ὥπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς, λέγει

Scholars frequently discuss two issues that are closely related to this interpretation of LXX Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15. First, in Acts 15:14, Luke has James refer to Cornelius and his household as λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. Since Luke elsewhere uses λαός to refer to Jews as the people of God,¹⁴³ some conclude that Luke identifies Cornelius and his household as λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ in order to portray non-Jews who believe in Jesus as true Israel.¹⁴⁴ Others suggest instead that Luke uses the term λαός in a more generic way in Acts 15:14. In this case, the phrase ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἔθνων λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ would not designate Cornelius and his household as a distinct cultural unit that becomes Israel.¹⁴⁵ To be sure, the phrase explains that God chose a group of non-Jews as his special possession, and this action parallels his selection and ownership of Israel. Nevertheless, neither Acts 15:14–21 nor LXX Amos 9:11–12 identify this group of non-Jews as the replacement for the Jewish people because of their chosen status. Rather than seeking to present non-Jews as Israel, Luke has Peter and James assert that they become recipients of the end-time blessings of God *as non-Jews*. Furthermore, since the point of the argument and the apostolic decree in Acts 15 is that non-Jews need not change their

κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα). The LXX version of Amos 9:11–12, in particular, serves Luke's (James') purpose because of its depiction of the inclusion of non-Jews.

¹⁴³ Luke 1:17, 68, 77; 2:32; 7:16, 29; 20:1; 22:66; 24:19; Acts 2:47; 3:23; 4:10; 5:12; 7:17, 34; 13:17.

¹⁴⁴ Johnson, *Acts*, 264: "By having God choose 'a people' from among Gentiles he suggests both an extension of the meaning of 'Israel' defined in terms of faith rather than in terms of ethnic or ritual allegiance, and a claim for the continuity of the Gentile mission with biblical history" (264). Similarly, Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles," 168–9, argues that ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἔθνων λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ derives from the phrase πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς (LXX Amos 9:12) and expresses the ownership of God, which in the Jewish scriptures usually refers to Israel, the people over whom the name of YHWH is invoked (Deut 28:10; 2 Chron 7:14; Jer 14:9; Dan 9:19; cf. Isa 43:7). Bauckham suggests that the prediction of LXX Amos 9:11–12 and this concept of ownership have the effect of extending Israel's covenant status and privilege to the nations; cf. Ådna, "James' Position," 149–50; Hermann Strathmann, "λαός," in *TDNT*, 4:54.

¹⁴⁵ Since Luke can use λαός to refer to Israel as the people of God in its totality (Luke 1:17, 68, 77; 2:32; 7:16, 29; 20:1; 22:66; 24:19; Acts 2:47; 3:23; 4:10; 5:12; 7:17, 34; 13:17) or to refer to a group of Israelites in a more generic sense (e.g., Luke 1:21; 3:15, 18; 7:1; 8:47; 20:1, 9, 45; Acts 2:47; 3:9, 11, 12; 4:1, 2, 17, 21; 5:13; 12:4; 21:30), the meaning that Luke intends in Acts 15:14 is not entirely clear. Dahl, "People for His Name," 326, argues that λαός in Acts 15:14 refers to a group of people out of the nations that belongs to God in the same way as Israel does but maintains that this identity does not call the distinct identity and status of Israel as the people of God into question; cf. J. Dupont, "Un peuple d'entre les nations (Actes 15.14)," *NTS* 31 (1985): 326–30; Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 66–7.

status or identity as non-Jews to become part of the Christ-believing community, it hardly seems logical for Luke to argue that they have become Israel, or the replacement for Jews.¹⁴⁶

A second and closely related interpretive issue surrounds the meaning of “the tent of David” (τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυίδ) in Acts 15:16 (cf. LXX Amos 9:11). The phrase may serve as a metaphor for the Christ-believing community,¹⁴⁷ the restoration of Israel,¹⁴⁸ or the resurrection and exaltation of Christ.¹⁴⁹ A number of scholars reject the latter interpretation because Acts 15:16–18 twice substitutes ἀνοικοδομήσω for the term ἀναστήσω from LXX Amos 9:11–12;¹⁵⁰ since Luke elsewhere uses ἀνίστημι to describe the resurrection of Christ or his status as the prophet like Moses (see, e.g., Luke 16:31; 18:33; 24:7, 46; Acts 2:24, 32; 3:22, 26; 7:37; 10:41; 17:3, 31), the use of ἀνοικοδομήσω rather than ἀναστήσω may suggest that Luke did not here wish to

¹⁴⁶ Regardless of the precise origins of the decree, it clearly outlines guidelines for non-Jews who join the Christ-believing community without converting to Judaism. For further discussion of the background of the decree and its purpose, see Barrett, *Acts*, 2:733–735; Justin Taylor, “The Jerusalem Decrees (Acts 15.20, 29 and 21.25 and the Incident at Antioch (Gal 2.11–14),” *NTS* 46 (2001): 372–80; Terrence Callan, “The Background of the Apostolic Decree,” *CBQ* 55 (1993): 295–6; S. G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (Cambridge: CUP, 1983), 84–192.

¹⁴⁷ Richard Bauckham, “James and the Gentiles,” 154–78; idem, “James and the Jerusalem Church,” in Richard Bauckham, ed., *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting* (vol. 4 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*; ed. Bruce W. Winter; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 452–62, in particular, has attempted to argue that the exegete responsible for the interpretation of LXX Amos 9:11–12 regarded “the tent of David” as the Christ-believing community which represented the eschatological temple of the messianic age. He maintains that the adaptations to the citation of LXX Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15:16–18 and its allusions to other scriptural passages confirm this interpretation. He also suggests that the widespread interpretation of the eschatological temple as the people of God in other early Christian literature strengthens the likelihood of this meaning in Acts 15:16–18 (see, e.g., 1 Cor 3:16–17; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:20–22; Heb 13:15–16; 1 Pet 2:5; 4:17; Rev 3:12; 11:1–2; Did. 10.2; Barn. 4.11; 6.15; 16.1–10; Hermas, *Vis.* 3; *Sim.* 9; Ignatius, *Eph.* 9:1).

¹⁴⁸ Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 51–69; idem, *Apostelgeschichte*, 395–6; cf. J. Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (London: SCM, 1959), 235. Jervell stresses that Luke does not present Jewish Christ-believers as new Israel but as restored Israel of old to whom the nations are added as an associate people.

¹⁴⁹ E.g., Haenchen, *Acts* 448; O’Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 14.

¹⁵⁰ See, e.g., Ådna, “James’ Position,” 133–6, 145–6; Bauckham, “James and the Gentiles,” 157–60; Barrett, *Acts*, 2:725–8; Marshall, *Acts*, 252; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 555. The Greek verb ἀνίστημι would also be the most natural translation of קוּם, the corresponding Hebrew verb from the MT of Amos 9:11. For further discussion, see Earl Richard, “The Creative Use of Amos by the Author of Acts,” *NovT* 24 (1982): 47; J. Dupont, “‘Je rebâtirai la cabane de David qui est tombée’ (Ac 15,16=Am 9,11),” in *Glaube und Eschatologie: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 80ten Geburtstag* (eds. Erich Grässer and Otto Merk; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985), 26.

refer to Christ or his resurrection. Still, the subsequent replacement of ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτήν (LXX Amos 9:11b) with ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν (Acts 15:16b) may evoke the image of the establishment of David's throne.¹⁵¹ The prevalence of the descriptions of Christ as the Davidic king and messiah elsewhere in Luke-Acts (e.g., Luke 1:32, 68–71; Acts 2:22–36) also makes it difficult to exclude the possibility that “the tent of David” refers in some way to the establishment of Christ as Davidic messiah and king in Acts 15:16–18.¹⁵² Moreover, as Max Turner aptly concludes, the restoration of David's rule and of Israel are virtually inseparable since the establishment of a Davidic king for Israel would include the restoration of Israel itself.¹⁵³

The likelihood that “the tent of David” refers in some way to the Christ-believing community has important repercussions for our interpretation of Acts 15:14–21. If the phrase serves as a metaphor for the restoration of Israel, as some scholars argue, Acts 15:14–21 would indicate that Jews who believe in Jesus represent the rebuilt “tent of David” and non-Jewish Christ-believers the nations who seek the Lord as an outcome of this Jewish restoration; the use of ὅπως in Acts 15:17 (cf. LXX Amos 9:12) signals that the rebuilding of “the tent of David” took place *in order that* the rest of humankind might seek the Lord. Alternatively, if “the tent of David” refers to the reconstitution of a new group, then the phrase would serve as a reference to both Jewish and non-Jewish Christ-believers. This latter interpretation, however, seems improbable since both Acts 15:16 and LXX Amos 9:11 depict “the tent of David” as an entity that remains distinct from the nations. To suggest that non-Jews form a part of the rebuilt “tent of David” makes the subsequent description of non-Jews who seek the Lord as a result of this rebuilding redundant.¹⁵⁴ The phrase “the tent of David” therefore probably refers to Jewish Christ-believers, or possibly to the Jerusalem church. Accordingly, Jews who believe in Jesus become heirs to the part of the promise of LXX Amos 9:11–12 that describes

¹⁵¹ See the use of ἀνορθώω in LXX 2 Sam 7:13, 16, 26; 1 Chron 17:12, 14, 24; 22:10.

¹⁵² So Dupont, “Je rebâtirai,” 19–32 and Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 185–92. For further discussion of the differing views regarding the referent of “the tent of David” in Acts 15:16, see Turner, *Power*, 313–5.

¹⁵³ Turner, *Power*, 313–5.

¹⁵⁴ J. Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1988), 37–9, correctly concludes, “the thrust of Acts 15:16–17 differentiates between the tabernacle of David and ‘the rest of men’, with the later being understood as ‘all the Gentiles’” (38).

the rebuilding of “the tent of David” whereas non-Jews who believe in Jesus, such as Cornelius and his household, become heirs to the part of the promise that depicts the inclusion of the non-Jews.

5.5.2 *The Promise of the Spirit in the Writings of Justin*

The descriptions of the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus in the *Dialogue* contain a number of elements that also occur in the gospel of Luke. According to both authors, the Holy Spirit came upon Jesus in the form (εἶδει) of a dove immediately after his water-baptism (Luke 3:22; *Dial.* 88.3, 8)¹⁵⁵ and a voice from heaven pronounced the words “you are my son” (Luke 3:22; *Dial.* 88.8).¹⁵⁶ The prominence that Justin gives to the “powers” (δυνάμεις) of the Spirit (*Dial.* 87.2, 3, 4; 88.1, 2) also resembles Luke’s emphasis upon the power of the Spirit in the ministry of Jesus,¹⁵⁷ and both Luke and Justin link the presence of the Spirit upon Jesus with the fulfillment of scriptural prophecy (Luke 4:18–21 [Isa 61:1–2; 58:6]; *Dial.* 87.2 [Isa 11:1–3]). Thus, even though Justin appears to draw upon more than one source to describe the baptism of Jesus,¹⁵⁸ he tells the same basic story as Luke, and even emphasizes

¹⁵⁵ Compare also Mark 1:10; Matt 3:16.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. *Dial.* 103.6; 122.5. In the course of describing the baptism of Jesus in *Dial.* 88.8 and 103.6, Justin cites a phrase from LXX Ps 2:7 (υἱός μου εἶ σύ ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε). In the latter context, he further indicates that this statement was recorded in the “memoirs of the apostles.” Notably, the Western text of Luke 3:22 (e.g., codex D) also cites this phrase from LXX Ps 2:7. Other manuscript traditions of Luke 3:22 make the link to Ps 2:7 less certain (e.g., σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα; cf. Mark 1:11; Matt 3:17). Although Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition* (Stuttgart, UBS, 1998), 112–3, regards the citation of Ps 2:7 as secondary, Andrew Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 269, suggests that it may be original to Luke; cf. B. D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York: OUP, 1993), 62–7.

¹⁵⁷ Luke stresses the “power” of Jesus’ ministry and links it more closely to the anointing of the Spirit than do the other synoptic gospel accounts. For example, Jesus returns from his wilderness temptations “in the power of the Spirit” (Luke 4:14; compare Mark 1:14a and Matt 4:12); the Spirit empowers Jesus’ ministry (Luke 4:18–19, 36; compare Mark 6:1–6a and Matt 13:53–58, where the “powers” of Jesus are mentioned); power (presumably from the Spirit) goes out of Jesus and heals people (Luke 5:17; 6:19; 8:46; compare Mark 3:10 and Matt 9:21; 14:36); and Peter recounts Jesus’ ministry by explaining how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power (Acts 10:38).

¹⁵⁸ As Graham N. Stanton, “The Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr” in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn* (eds. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton; Cambridge: Eerdmans,

some elements that are unique, among the Gospel accounts, to the Lukan narrative.¹⁵⁹

Despite the similarity between their descriptions of the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus, Luke and Justin do not portray this event and its effects in an entirely congruent manner. Whereas Luke has Jesus cite LXX Isa 61:1–2 (cf. 58:6) to demonstrate how the Spirit empowered him for ministry, Justin has Trypho cite LXX Isa 11:1–3 in order to challenge the pre-existent identity of Jesus:¹⁶⁰

Εἰπὲ οὖν μοι, διὰ τοῦ Ἡσαίου εἰπόντος τοῦ Λόγου· Ἐξελεύσεται ῥάβδος ἐκ τῆς ρίζης Ἰεσσαί Καὶ ἀναπαύσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πνεῦμα θεοῦ, πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως, πνεῦμα βουλῆς καὶ ἰσχύος, πνεῦμα γνώσεως καὶ εὐσεβείας· καὶ ἐμπλήσει αὐτὸν πνεῦμα φόβου θεοῦ, ὡς ὡμολόγησας πρὸς με ταῦτα, ἔλεγεν, εἰς Χριστὸν εἰρήσθαι, καὶ θεὸν αὐτὸν προϋπάρχοντα λέγεις, καὶ κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντα

2004), 324, notes, Justin draws upon a non-synoptic tradition when he recounts that a fire was kindled in the Jordan at the baptism of Jesus (*Dial.* 88.3). He suggests, however, that the link between the Spirit and fire in the account of Jesus' baptism may be drawn from the double tradition (Matt 3:11; Luke 3:16); cf. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 199.

¹⁵⁹ Perhaps it is also significant that neither Luke nor Justin explicitly report that John baptized Jesus. Compare Matt 3:13–17 and Mark 1:9–11.

¹⁶⁰ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 274–5, suggests that the citation of Isa 11:1 and 11:2 as well as the description of Christ as the recipient and sender of the Spirit in *Dialogue* 39 and 87 closely parallels *T. Lev.* 18:6–7 and *T. Jud.* 24:2–3. By applying a number of scriptural references to the restoration of Israel (e.g., Num 24:17; Mal 4:2; Zech 12:10; Joel 2:28–29) when describing the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus, *T. Jud.* 24 appears to assume continuity between this event and the fulfillment of God's promises for Israel. *T. Lev.* 18.6–9 recounts a similar version of the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus at his baptism, but some versions of this text (manuscripts other than *b* and *k*) also depict the darkening and diminishment of Israel. Notably, this latter description resembles that of Justin in *Dialogue* 87. M. De Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and The Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (SVTP 18; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 101–4, suggests that Christian redactors of the *TP* attempt to portray Jesus as the savior of non-Jews and Jews. That this report of Jesus' baptism is Christian material perhaps goes without saying, but part of the debate surrounding the date and origins of the *TP* is noteworthy. H. C. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 1:775–80, affirms that the Christian interpolations of the *TP* probably date from early in the second century CE, but argues that the document is primarily Jewish and from the 2nd century BCE. Alternatively, H. W. Hollander and M. De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 154, argue that the text in its redacted form contains a diverse collection of biographical, apocalyptic, and exhortatory traditions, making a reconstruction of the original document as exclusively Christian or Jewish next to impossible. As these authors rightly conclude, Christian material permeates the text, thereby precluding a straightforward distinction between its Jewish and Christian elements.

αὐτὸν λέγεις διὰ τῆς παρθένου γεγενῆσθαι ἄνθρωπον· πῶς δύναται ἀποδειχθῆναι προϋπάρχων ὅστις διὰ τῶν δυνάμεων τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, ὃς καταριθμεῖ ὁ Λόγος διὰ Ἡσαΐου, πληροῦται ὡς ἐνδεῆς τούτων ὑπάρχων;

Tell, me, therefore, what the scripture says through Isaiah: “A rod shall come forth from the root of Jesse.... And the Spirit of God shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and strength, the spirit of knowledge and piety; and the spirit of the fear of God shall fill him” (Isa 11:1–3). As you have admitted to me, he said, these things were spoken with reference to Christ, and you say that he pre-existed as God, and you say that he has been born a human through a virgin, becoming incarnate according to the will of God. How can he be demonstrated to pre-exist who is filled by the powers of the Holy Spirit, which the scripture enumerates through Isaiah, as though he lacks these things?

(*Dial.* 87.2)

Although Justin subsequently affirms that Christ fulfilled LXX Isa 11:1–3 (*Dial.* 87.3), he argues that Jesus in no way needed the powers of the Spirit to perform his messianic role.¹⁶¹ To suggest that he did need these powers could lead to the conclusion that Christ did not exist as God prior to his birth as a human.¹⁶² Justin avoids this conclusion by offering a different explanation for the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus:

Ταύτας τὰς κατηριθμημένας τοῦ πνεύματος δυνάμεις οὐχ ὡς ἐνδεοῦς αὐτοῦ τούτων ὄντος φησὶν ὁ Λόγος ἐπεληλυθῆναι ἐπ’ αὐτόν, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐπ’ ἐκεῖνον ἀνάπαιυσιν μελλουσῶν ποιεῖσθαι, τουτέστιν ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ πέρας ποιεῖσθαι, τοῦ μηκέτι ἐν τῷ γένει ὑμῶν κατὰ τὸ παλαιὸν ἔθος προφῆτας

¹⁶¹ Although Justin frequently uses δύναιμι, often in conjunction with λόγος, to describe Christ prior to his incarnation (1 *Apol.* 23.3; 32.10; 33.6; *Dial.* 105.1; 125.3; 128.4), he uses the term δυνάμεων in *Dial.* 87.2 to communicate that the powers of the Spirit were distinct from and unnecessary for Christ; because he was pre-existent, he already had “power” and therefore did not need the “powers” of the Spirit. For further discussion, see Demetrius C. Trakatellis, *The Pre-Existence of Christ in Justin Martyr* (HDR 6; Missoula: Scholars, 1976), 27–37.

¹⁶² According to Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 195–9, Justin suppresses source material that links the baptism of Jesus with Isa 11:2–3 in order to avoid promoting an adoptionist theology (*Dialogue* 49–51; 87); cf. Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923), 186–7. This also seems to be the intent of the description of the baptism of Christ in *Dial.* 88.3–4 where Justin asserts that Christ did not need to go to the Jordan for baptism but did it solely “for the sake of humankind” (*Dial.* 88.4); that is, he underwent baptism to prove to those who watched the event that he was God’s son.

γενήσεσθαι, ὅπερ καὶ ὅψει ὑμῖν ἰδεῖν ἔστι· μετ' ἐκείνον γὰρ οὐδεὶς ὅλως προφήτης παρ' ὑμῖν γεγένηται.

The scripture states that these enumerated powers of the Spirit have come upon him not as though he lacked these things, but because they were going to make a rest upon him, that is, to make an end in him, in order that there would no longer be¹⁶³ prophets according to the ancient custom among your race, as it is plain for you to see, for after him there has not been any prophet among you.

(*Dial.* 87.3)

Rather than providing Jesus with the ability to fulfill his prophetic and messianic role, Justin argues, the gifts of the Spirit rested on him in the sense that there would be no more prophets among the Jewish people.¹⁶⁴ Therefore, although Justin affirms that the anointing of Jesus took place in fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures, even as Luke also does, he argues that Jesus did not need the powers of the Spirit, and maintains that the blessings promised in LXX Isa 11:2–3 found their fulfillment by being directed away from rather than toward the Jewish people.

After presenting his version of how the Spirit came to rest upon Jesus, Justin states that Jesus then transferred the Spirit to Christ-believers. According to Justin, the powers that once resided with Jews now rest upon those who believe in Jesus as messiah:

Ἀνεπαύσατο οὖν, τούτέστιν ἐπαύσατο, ἐλθόντος ἐκείνου, μεθ' ὃν τῆς οἰκονομίας ταύτης τῆς ἐν ἀνθρώποις αὐτοῦ γενομένης χρόνοις, παύσασθαι ἔδει αὐτὰ ἀφ' ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἀνάπανσιν λαβόντα πάλιν,¹⁶⁵ ὥς ἐπεπροφήτευτο γενήσεσθαι δόματα, ἃ ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τῆς

¹⁶³ If we interpret τοῦ γενήσεσθαι as an infinitive of purpose, Justin's account of the bestowal of the Spirit upon Jesus reads as an event that occurred in order to bring an end to the activity of the Spirit among Israel's prophets.

¹⁶⁴ According to Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 197, Justin's argument that the Spirit and gifts of the Spirit were no longer among Israel in *Dialogue* 87 relates to his assertion that Jesus made John, a prophet to Israel, stop prophesying and baptizing (*Dialogue* 49–51). For further discussion of this passage, see Rudolph, *Denn wir sind jenes Volk*, 165–7, who maintains that the descriptions of John the Baptist and Jesus in *Dialogue* 49–52 are closely tied to Justin's concept of universality.

¹⁶⁵ As Marcovich, *Iustini*, 13, notes, this part of *Dialogue* 87 is difficult to decipher because of heavy corruption and dislocation of text. Here I have chosen to follow Thirlby's arrangement rather than that of Marcovich whose reconstruction makes the syntax particularly awkward: μεθ' ὃν <διὰ> τῆς οἰκονομίας ταύτης παύσασθαι ἔδει αὐτὰ ἀφ' ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἀνάπανσιν λαβόντα πάλιν <ἐπελθεῖν> τοῖς ἐν χρόνῳ ἀνθρώποις αὐτοῦ γενομένοις.

δυνάμεως τοῦ πνεύματος ἐκείνου τοῖς ἐπ' αὐτὸν πιστεύουσι δίδωσιν, ὥς ἄξιον ἕκαστον ἐπίσταται.

Therefore it (the Spirit) rested, that is, it ceased, when he (Christ) came, after whom, in the times of this redemption that he accomplished among humans, it was necessary for them (i.e., the gifts of the Spirit) to cease from among you (the Jewish people), and after receiving a resting place again in this one (Christ), as it was prophesied, should become gifts that, by the grace of the power of his Spirit, he gives to those who believe in him, as he deems each worthy.

(*Dial.* 87.5–6)

In Justin's telling, the Spirit-baptism of Jesus led to the end of its activity among Jews and to its subsequent descent upon Christ-believers.¹⁶⁶ For Justin, moreover, the presence of the gifts of the Spirit among Christ-believers furnishes proof that this transfer had certainly taken place: "From the fact that even until now the prophetic gifts exist among us (Christians), you ought to realize that those (gifts) that long ago were among your race have been transferred to us" (*Dial.* 82.1; cf. 88.1).

Following this representation of the removal of the Spirit from the Jewish people, Justin provides an explanation for this event that closely resembles material from Luke-Acts. He asserts that the scriptures foretell that the Spirit would descend upon believers after the departure of Jesus to heaven:

<Καὶ> ὅτι ἐπεπροφῆτευτο τοῦτο μέλλειν γίνεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ τὴν εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνέλευσιν αὐτοῦ, εἶπον μὲν ἤδη καὶ πάλιν λέγω. Εἶπεν οὖν Ἀνέβη εἰς ὕψος, ἡχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν, ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἑτέρᾳ προφητείᾳ εἴρηται· Καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα, ἐκχεῶ τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου καὶ προφητεύσουσι.

¹⁶⁶ In view of Trypho's earlier argument that the true Messiah must be anointed by Elijah (*Dial.* 8.4; 49.1), we might expect Justin to indicate here that Jesus received such an anointing when he was baptized by John (cf. *Dial.* 49:3–5). This would explain why Jesus received the Spirit even though he was pre-existent and didn't need the anointing of the Spirit. Instead, however, Justin uses a different type of logic to explain the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 197, suggests that Justin wishes to communicate the following: "just as Jesus made John cease prophesying and baptizing, so he puts an end to the distribution of the gifts of the Spirit among the Jews." Similarly, in *Dial.* 51.3, Justin indicates that Christ, the new covenant, replaces the Jewish prophets and cites a saying from the double tradition to validate this conclusion (Matt 11:12–15; cf. Luke 16:16). Notably, in this latter context, Justin follows Matthew more closely than Luke and omits the affirmation of the Mosaic law expressed in Luke 16:17.

I have already said, and I say again, <even> that it had been prophesied that this was going to be done by him after his ascension into heaven. It says, therefore: "He ascended on high; he led captivity captive; he gave gifts to humankind" (LXX Ps 67:19).¹⁶⁷ And again in another prophecy it has been said: "And it shall be that after these things, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh and upon my servants, and upon my handmaids and they shall prophesy" (LXX Joel 3:1–2).¹⁶⁸ (*Dial.* 87.6)

This statement highlights that the descent of the Spirit occurred through the agency of Jesus after his ascension and according to God's foreknowledge and plan. Such a description parallels Luke's account where we read that, in fulfillment of God's purposes, Jesus ascended to the right hand of the Father and poured out the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:17–36). Furthermore, both Luke and Justin cite LXX Joel 3:1–2 to prove that the descent of the Spirit upon believers was the fulfillment of ancient prophecy (Acts 2:17–21; *Dial.* 87.6), and both present the activity of the Spirit as a type of prophetic empowerment.¹⁶⁹

Although these notable similarities may suggest that Justin relied on Luke for this part of his description of the Spirit, or that they drew upon a common source, their respective representations of how Christ fulfilled scriptural promises for Jews and non-Jews differ. Luke has Peter appeal to LXX Joel 3:1–5 to portray the descent of the Spirit as the fulfillment of God's promises for the Jewish people, and explicitly indicate that it applies to this group ("the promise is for you, for your children"; Acts 2:39). Luke also alludes to LXX Joel 3 to foreshadow the inclusion of non-Jews, but he never indicates in this passage that non-Jews replace Jews as the recipients of the Spirit. By contrast, Justin

¹⁶⁷ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 100, 275, and Stanton, "Spirit," 332, both observe that Justin appears to follow the quotation of LXX Ps 67:19 found in Eph. 4:8, suggesting his dependence on the latter.

¹⁶⁸ Stanton, "Spirit," 332, notes that Justin's use of μετὰ ταῦτα rather than ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις (Acts 2:17) makes this part of the citation closer to LXX Joel 3:1. He observes, however, that the phrase ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου used by Justin corresponds more closely to Acts 2:18 than to the parallel phrase in LXX Joel 3:2a (ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας).

¹⁶⁹ In *Dial.* 87.3–4, Justin describes how the presence and gifts of the Spirit were upon the ancient prophets, and in *Dial.* 87.5 he explains how the same empowerment and gifts were distributed to Christ-believers. In so doing, he portrays the descent of the Spirit as a form of prophetic inspiration. Similarly, Luke highlights the prophetic aspect of the descent of the Spirit by adding the phrase "and they will prophesy" (καὶ προφητεύουσιν) at the end of his citation of LXX Joel 3:1–2 (Acts 2:18), and by indicating that the descent of the Spirit upon the disciples led to inspired speech (Acts 2:4, 11).

cites LXX Ps 67:19 and Joel 3:1–2 in order to justify his conclusion that Jesus transferred the Spirit from Jewish prophets to non-Jewish Christ-believers. Accordingly, in his view, the latter group becomes the new beneficiary of the scriptural promises that were originally intended for Jews.¹⁷⁰ If Justin did use Acts as a source for his description of the descent of the Spirit, he also transformed its interpretation of LXX Joel 3 so that the promises therein no longer applied to Jews.

In view of their divergent explanations of how Jesus fulfilled LXX Joel 3, the difference between the way that Luke and Justin cite this passage may also be significant. Luke follows a version of LXX Joel 3:1 that supports his conclusion that the Jewish audience of Peter would receive the promised end-time blessing of the Spirit; it states that “*your sons and your daughters*” (οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν), “*your young men*” (οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν), and “*your elders*” (οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν) would become the recipients of the Spirit (Acts 2:17). Justin, by contrast, makes no reference to the part of LXX Joel 3:1 that includes these second-person plural pronouns. As a result, his citation of LXX Joel 3:1–2 reads as a prediction of the descent of the Spirit upon all flesh without any reference to the restoration of the Jewish people: “I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and upon my servants and upon my handmaids.” While it is possible that Justin relied on a different version of the citation,¹⁷¹ it is notable that he (or his source) omitted the specific part of LXX Joel 3:1–2 that clearly describes the descent of the Spirit upon the Jewish people.¹⁷²

¹⁷⁰ As Rudolph, *Denn wir sind jenes Volk*, 126–8, observes, the transfer of the Spirit represents a transfer of the promises of Israel to Christ-believers which legitimates their status as the true people of God: “Nicht die Tatsache, dass im neuen universalen Gottesvolk Wunder und Charismen lebendig sind, ist der Beweis seiner Gottgewirktheit, sondern dieser Beweis liegt in der Tatsache, dass die Wunder und Geistesgaben, die die Christen aufzuweisen haben, von den Propheten vorhergesagt wurden. Die Erfüllung dieser Verheissung im Leben der Christen und somit in der Geschichte zeigt, dass das neue Gottesvolk von Gott legitimiert ist” (127).

¹⁷¹ In *Proof from Prophecy*, 122–3, Skarsaune expresses his uncertainty regarding this unusual citation—he wonders if it is the unique work of Justin, a composition from someone who used the Hebrew text rather than the LXX, or a condensed version of the Acts citation. Stanton, “Spirit,” 332–3, suggests that Justin uses a condensed version of the Acts citation to emphasize the gift of prophecy, since a discussion of the gifts, especially prophecy, follows in *Dial.* 88.1. The complete citation of Acts 2:17–18 would have placed greater emphasis upon prophecy, however, because of the addition of the phrase “and they will prophesy” (καὶ προφητεύσουσιν) in Acts 2:18. Prigent, *l’Ancien Testament*, 114, suggests direct dependence upon Acts 2:17–21.

¹⁷² The discrepancies between the form of LXX Joel 3:1–2 in the Alexandrian textual tradition and the form of the citation in the Codex Bezae of Acts 2:17, 39 are also

In *Dial.* 135.1–6, Justin asserts in an even more pronounced way that non-Jewish Christ-believers were the recipients of the Spirit and heirs to the scriptural promises that God originally made to Jews. He begins this argument by claiming that Christ is the referent of “Israel” and “Jacob” in Isa 42:1–4 and that those who “are hewn out of the side of Christ” also possess the identity of true Israel (*Dial.* 135.1–3).¹⁷³ This discussion leads into his citation and interpretation of Isa 65:9–12:

Αὐτῷ δὲ μᾶλλον τῷ ῥητῷ προσέχωμεν. Καὶ ἐξάξω, φησί, τὸ ἐξ Ἰακώβ σπέρμα καὶ ἐξ Ἰουδα· καὶ κληρονομήσει τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου, καὶ κληρονομήσουσιν οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ μου καὶ οἱ δοῦλοί μου, καὶ κατοικήσουσιν ἐκεῖ... Ὑμεῖς δέ, οἱ ἐγκαταλείποντές με καὶ ἐπιλανθανόμενοι τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου... ἐγὼ παραδώσω ὑμᾶς εἰς μάχαιραν... καὶ ἐποιήσατε τὸ πονηρὸν ἐνώπιόν μου, καὶ ἃ οὐκ ἐβουλόμην ἐξελέξασθε. Καὶ τὰ μὲν τῆς γραφῆς ταῦτα· συννοεῖτε δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ ὅτι ἄλλο τί ἐστὶ τὸ ἐξ Ἰακώβ σπέρμα νῦν λεγόμενον, οὐδ', ὡς οἰηθεῖ τις ἄν, περὶ τοῦ <ὑμετέρου> λαοῦ λέγεσθαι. Οὐ γὰρ ἐνδέχεται <τὸν> τοῖς ἐξ Ἰακώβ γεγεννημένοις <ἀπειλοῦντα> ἀπολιπεῖν <αὐτούς> ἔπ<ειτα> ἐξάξειν τοὺς ἐξ Ἰακώβ σπαρέντας, οὐδὲ <τὸν> ὀνειδίζοντα τῷ λαῷ ὡς μὴ ἀξίῳ τῆς κληρονομίας πάλιν, ὡς ὑπολαβόμενον, τοῖς αὐτοῖς <αὐτήν> ὑπισχνεῖσθαι. Ἄλλ' ὅνπερ τρόπον ἐκεῖ φησιν ὁ προφήτης· Καὶ νῦν... ἀνῆκε γὰρ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ, ὅτι ἐπλήσθη ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν, ὡς τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, μαντειῶν καὶ κληδονισμῶν, οὕτω καὶ ἐνθάδε δεῖ νοεῖν ἡμᾶς δύο <ὄντα> σπέρματα Ἰουδα καὶ δύο γένη, (ὡς <καὶ ἐκεῖ> δύο οἴκους Ἰακώβ), τὸ μὲν ἐξ αἵματος καὶ σαρκός, τὸ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως καὶ πνεύματος γεγεννημένον.

noteworthy. The Codex Bezae rendering of LXX Joel 3:1–2 changes the second-person plural pronouns after “sons” and “daughters” to the third-person and removes the second-person plural pronouns from “young men” and “elders.” This, in addition to the change of the phrase “upon all flesh” from the singular (ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα) to the plural form (ἐπὶ πάσας σάρκας), makes the citation read as a universalistic statement that has no particular application to Jews: “I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh and their sons and their daughters shall prophesy and young men shall see visions and elders shall dream dreams.” Codex Bezae also renders Acts 2:39 as a promise that may apply more specifically to the apostles and their group than to Jews in the audience of Peter: “for the promise is for us (ἡμῖν) and for our children (τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν).” Regarding these differences in the text of Codex Bezae, Eldon Jay Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (SNTSMS 3; Cambridge: CUP, 1966), 69, argues that the “conception of Peter’s address as envisioning Gentiles is contradictory to the Lucan conception that the sermon here was directed only toward Jews (though they were Jews from all over the world) and that the Gentile mission first began later with Cornelius.” For a more recent discussion of Acts 2:17–39 in the Bezan text, see Josep Rius-Camps and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition* (JSNTSup 257; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 169–91.

¹⁷³ Compare this description of Christ-believers with the possible allusion to the metaphor of hewn rock in Isa 51:1 from the double tradition: “God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham” (Luke 3:8; cf. Matt 3:9).

But let us pay attention, rather, to the very word: “And I will bring forth,” he says, “the seed from Jacob and from Judah, and it shall inherit my holy mountain. My elect and my servants shall inherit (it) and dwell there. . . . But you who forsake me and forget my holy mountain . . . I will hand you over to the sword . . . and you did evil before me, and you chose the things that I did not desire” (Isa 65:9–12). These things indeed are from the scripture. And you yourselves can understand that what is now called the seed of Jacob is another, not spoken about <your> people as someone might suppose. For it is not possible that <the one who threatened> to leave behind those who have been begotten from Jacob would then lead <them> out,¹⁷⁴ who were from the seed of Jacob, nor that <the one> who reproaches the people as unworthy of the inheritance should promise <it> again to them, as though they were accepted. But as in the manner that the prophet says there, “And now . . . for he has dismissed his people, the house of Jacob, because their land was filled, as from the beginning, with oracles and divinations” (Isa 2:5–6), thus it is also necessary for us here to recognize that there <are> two seeds of Judah, and two races as <also there> two houses of Jacob: the one has been born from flesh and blood, but the other from faith and Spirit. (*Dial.* 135.4–6)

Since Justin deems Jews unworthy of inheriting the blessings promised to them in Isa 65:9–10, he concludes that there must be another type of “seed” that receives this inheritance. Subsequently, he cites Isa 2:5–6 to reiterate that God rejected the Jewish people because of their sin (Isa 2:5–6). This enables him to conclude that the “seed” born of faith and Spirit (i.e., Christ-believers), rather than the physical descendants of Jacob and Judah, becomes heir to the eschatological blessings promised to Jews.¹⁷⁵

Although Justin clearly argues that God transferred the Spirit and scriptural promises from Jews to non-Jews in *Dialogue* 87 and 135, it is important to note that he also recognizes that Jews who repent and believe in Jesus receive the Spirit. In particular, he implies in *Dial.* 39.2–4 that a remnant of Jews, like the seven thousand who did not

¹⁷⁴ Marcovich, *Iustini*, 21, concludes that what is often translated as “right of entrance” (ἐπεῖσαξις) actually represents a textual corruption of ἔπ<ειτα> ἐξάξειν. My translation follows this conclusion; cf. Halton, *St. Justin*, 204.

¹⁷⁵ Note the corresponding theme in Galatians 3 where Paul asserts that non-Jews receive the promise of the Spirit through faith (Gal 3:14) and become heirs of the promises made to the seed of Abraham (Gal 3:19–28).

bow their knee to Baal during the days of Elijah,¹⁷⁶ have become disciples of Christ and so receive the gifts of the Spirit:

“Ὅν οὖν τρόπον διὰ τοὺς ἑπτακισχιλίους ἐκείνους τὴν ὁργὴν οὐκ ἐπέφερε τότε ὁ θεός, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ νῦν οὐδέπω τὴν κρίσιν ἐπήνεγκεν ἢ ἐπάγει, γινώσκων ἔτι καθ’ ἡμέραν τινὰς μαθητευομένους εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπολείποντας τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς πλάνης, οἱ καὶ λαμβάνουσι δόματα ἕκαστος ὡς ἄξιοί εἰσι, φωτιζόμενοι διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ τούτου· ὁ μὲν γὰρ λαμβάνει συνέσεως πνεῦμα, ὁ δὲ βουλῆς, ὁ δὲ ἰσχύος, ὁ δὲ ἰάσεως, ὁ δὲ προγνώσεως, ὁ δὲ διδασκαλίας, ὁ δὲ φόβου θεοῦ... ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνέλευσιν προεφητεύθη αἰχμαλωτεῦσαι αὐτὸν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς πλάνης καὶ δοῦναι ἡμῖν δόματα. Εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι· Ἀνέβη εἰς ὕψος, ἡχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν, ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

Therefore, just as God did not then inflict anger on account of those seven thousand, in the same manner also now he has neither brought nor brings judgment, because he knows that daily some (Jews) are becoming disciples in the name of his Christ, forsaking the path of error; who also receive gifts, each as they are worthy, being enlightened through the name of this Christ. For one receives the spirit of understanding, another of counsel, another of strength, another of healing, another of foreknowledge, another of teaching, and another of the fear of God... but it was predicted that, after the ascension of Christ into heaven, he would deliver us from error and give us gifts.¹⁷⁷ The words are these: “He ascended on high; he led captivity captive; he gave gifts to men” (LXX Ps 67:19). (*Dial.* 39.2–4)

As in *Dialogue* 87, Justin here indicates that Christ distributed the gifts of the Spirit after his ascension and in fulfillment of prophecy. Moreover, he refers to the daily (καθ’ ἡμέραν) repentance and salvation of some Jews, a description that bears similarity to the reports of the daily (καθ’ ἡμέραν) growth of the Jewish Christ-believing community in Acts (Acts 2:47; 16:5). Nevertheless, even in this context, Justin contrasts Jews with Christ-believers by stating that “you (Jews) hate us (Christians) who have understood these things and convict you of continual hardness of heart” (*Dial.* 39.1) and by reiterating the

¹⁷⁶ See also Paul’s description of a remnant of Jews who were chosen by God’s grace (Rom 11:1–4).

¹⁷⁷ As Stanton, “Spirit,” 332, notes, the list of the gifts of the Spirit in this passage is similar to the list in *Dial.* 87.2, but here Justin does not refer explicitly to Isa 11:1–3. Stanton also suggests that Justin depends upon 1 Corinthians 12—either directly or indirectly—in his references to gifts of “healing” (1 Cor 12:9b), “foreknowledge” (1 Cor 12:10b), and “teaching” (1 Cor 12:28); cf. Prigent, *l’Ancien Testament*, 112.

blindness of Jews: “we...prove from the words of prophecy that you ‘who are wise in your own eyes and understanding in your own sight’ (Isa 5:21) are foolish, for you honor God and his Christ only with your lips” (*Dial.* 39.5). Justin thus frames his recognition that a remnant of Jews believe in Jesus with negative statements about the misunderstanding of the Jewish nation as a whole.

Summary

Both Luke and Justin portray the gift of the Spirit as the possession of all Christ-believers, but their explanations of how the descent of the Spirit fulfills scriptural promises for Jews and non-Jews differ. Justin describes the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus as a transfer of this gift away from Jews. He argues that, in fulfillment of LXX Joel 3:1–2 and Ps 67:19, Christ removed the Spirit from Jews and redistributed this gift to the Christ-believing community. By contrast, Luke presents the outpouring of the Spirit upon Jewish Christ-believers as the fulfillment of scriptural promises made to Jews (e.g., LXX Joel 3:1–2) but depicts the descent of the Spirit upon non-Jews as the realization of promises that foretell the inclusion of the nations (e.g., LXX Amos 9:11–12).

5.6 CONCLUSION

Important similarities between the thought of Luke and Justin emerge from my comparison of their respective depictions of the fulfillment of Abrahamic and Isaianic promises, and the descent of the Spirit. Both authors consistently characterize all Christ-believers with reference to their possession of the following defining qualities or gifts: 1) repentance and obedience; 2) correct understanding of the scriptures and the message of God; and 3) the gift of the Spirit. For Luke and Justin, these particular attributes demonstrate that Christ-believers alone receive the benefits of Christ’s fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures. In this sense, Luke and Justin similarly articulate the identity of the Christ-believers by outlining their distinct status as recipients of the blessings that the Jewish scriptures promise.

Although both Luke and Justin present Christ-believers as the exclusive beneficiaries of the promises of scripture, they provide notably different descriptions of how Jewish and non-Jewish members of the community participate in these promises. Luke presents Jewish Christ-believers as heirs of the scriptural promises that God made to Israel

but portrays non-Jewish Christ-believers as heirs of the promises that predict the inclusion of the nations. Even when he narrates a Jewish rejection of the message of Jesus, Luke does not attempt to revise his depiction of Jews as heirs to the promises that God made to them. Instead, he persistently demonstrates the fidelity of God to fulfill his promises to the Jewish people and depicts Jews who believe in Jesus as the beneficiaries of this fulfillment. By way of contrast, Justin presents a more thoroughgoing revision of the identity of the people of God. For him, the experience of the Spirit, repentance, and the correct understanding of the scriptures serve as proof that the entire group—primarily comprised of non-Jews—has attained proper covenantal status and the right to become recipients of the scriptural promises and legacy of Jews. Accordingly, he maintains that these characteristics authenticate their status as true Israel, and show them to be the rightful heirs of the scriptural promises made to the Jewish people.

CONCLUSION

This investigation has compared the way that Luke and Justin laid claim to the Jewish scriptures for the Christ-believing community by considering two aspects of their representation of the relationship between this group and the sacred texts of Jews: the authoritative exegesis of Christ-believers (Part One) and their identity as recipients of scriptural promises (Part Two). In Part One, I argued that a number of early Jewish texts provide evidence of the emergence of an appeal to divinely inspired exegesis as a mode of revelation during the Second Temple period and concluded that, for some early Jewish groups, the claim to possess an authoritative ability to interpret the scriptures also served as a means of articulating group identity (Chapter One). Subsequently, I outlined the ways that Luke and Justin use similar exegetical claims to define Christ-believers as those who possess an exclusive understanding of the Jewish scriptures (Chapter Two).

Although both Luke and Justin lay claim to the Jewish scriptures in order to define the identity of the Christ-believing community in relation to Jews, I also pointed out at the end of Chapter Two and in Chapter Three that Justin develops this theme further: he asserts that the Jewish scriptures are more ancient than and therefore superior to non-Jewish traditions, and presents the exegesis of Christ-believers as a form of philosophical inquiry that rivals Greco-Roman philosophy. This self-defining strategy involves juxtaposing the Jewish scriptures with competing sources of ancient knowledge and stands squarely within early Jewish and Christian apologetic traditions. Such an exegetical approach in the writings of Justin differs significantly from that of Luke, who never asserts the superiority of the Jewish scriptures over non-Jewish traditions and consistently confines his depictions of the exegesis of Christ-believers to contexts where they interact with Jews or Jewish traditions. These findings call into question the conclusions of scholars who argue that Luke appeals to the Jewish scriptures in order to demonstrate the antiquity of the Christ-believing community in relation to competing non-Jewish groups within the Roman Empire.

In second part of my study, I evaluated the manner in which Luke and Justin portray Christ-believers as the recipients of scriptural

promises. In Chapter Four, I discussed their common presentation of the exegesis of Christ-believers as a manifestation of the fulfillment of end-time scriptural predictions. Correspondingly, I noted that Justin and Luke appeal to prophetic texts to provide a scriptural warrant for the exclusion of those who reject their message and exegesis. These mutually supporting explanations of how insiders and outsiders experience the fulfillment of scriptural predictions serve to strengthen the identity of the Christ-believing community as the only group that truly understands the Jewish scriptures and the will of God.

Notwithstanding their deployment of these complementary themes, I argued that the perspectives of Luke and Justin are not wholly congruent. Luke portrays a division among Jews on the basis of their response to the message and scriptural interpretation of Jesus. To those who embrace this proclamation, he applies ancient oracles of blessing; conversely, to those who reject it, he applies ancient oracles of judgment. By way of contrast, Justin typically aligns his division between those who understand the Jewish scriptures and those who do not with a division between Jews and non-Jewish Christ-believers, as if these two types of contrasts were overlapping distinctions. Accordingly, he interprets prophecies that express a Deuteronomic warning of judgment as predictions about the Jewish nation as a whole, but applies prophetic oracles of salvation to non-Jews who believe in Jesus. This part of my comparison demonstrates that Justin develops a contrast between non-Jewish Christ-believers and Jews in a manner that extends in a different direction than the thought of Luke. Additionally, my examination highlights the way that the emphasis in Luke-Acts rests more squarely upon a distinction between those who understand and those who misunderstand, or reject, the message and scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers than upon a denunciation of the Jewish people. Rather than equating the division over the exegesis and message of Jesus with a distinction between Jews and non-Jews, Luke envisages the inclusion or exclusion of all peoples on the basis of their acceptance or rejection of this proclamation.

Finally, in Chapter Five, I evaluated their respective representations of Christ-believers as the recipients of scriptural promises. Here, too, the use of similar traditions from the Jewish scriptures shows a close affinity between the writings of Luke and Justin (Abrahamic promises, Isaianic promises, and the promise of the Spirit). Both Luke and Justin present all Christ-believers as beneficiaries of these promises because of their possession of the Spirit, repentance, and correct understand-

ing of the scriptures. Despite these parallels, however, Luke and Justin offer different explanations for how and why Jewish and non-Jewish Christ-believers benefit from the promises of scripture. For Justin, the possession of the gift of the Spirit, repentance, and the correct understanding of the scriptures serve as proof that the entire Christ-believing community has attained proper covenantal status; as "true Israel," this group becomes heir to the scriptural promises and legacy of Jews. Although Luke also presents the gift of the Spirit, repentance, and the correct understanding of the scriptures as evidence that both Jewish and non-Jewish members of the Christ-believing community have received Christ's fulfillment of the scriptures, he does not for this reason conclude that non-Jews become heirs to the promises that God originally made to Jews. Instead, Luke portrays Jewish and non-Jewish Christ-believers as recipients of different types of scriptural promises: the former receive the promises made to Israel and the latter become beneficiaries of the promises that predict the inclusion of the nations. Thus, although both Luke and Justin define the boundaries of the Christ-believing community, in part, by identifying Christ-believers as the group that possesses the Spirit, repentance, and an exclusive understanding of the Jewish scriptures, they do not describe insiders to the community in precisely the same way. Unlike Justin, Luke distinguishes between the identity and heritage of Jewish and non-Jewish members of the Christ-believing community. In so doing, he recognizes the distinct status of Jewish Christ-believers in relation to their scriptures even as he excludes Jews who do not embrace the exegesis and message of Jesus.

The concern of Luke to differentiate between the way that Jews and non-Jews become recipients of scriptural promises suggests that he sees a vital role for both groups within the Christ-believing community. Justin, however, frequently describes the Christ-believing community primarily as a non-Jewish group, and regards Jewish Christ-believers as an anomaly. Although this difference does not provide conclusive evidence that Justin wrote at a significantly later date than Luke, it does, at the very least, suggest that the writings of Luke and Justin emerge from different socio-religious milieus. That Luke does not use the Jewish scriptures to demonstrate the antiquity of the Christ-believing community or present them as the object of philosophical inquiry further suggests that he wrote during a period prior to the development of this use of the Jewish scriptures within the Christian tradition, or in a context where this practice was not yet current.

Although the specific reasons for the differences between the thought of Luke and Justin may be difficult to determine with certainty, it remains clear that each configures the relationship between Christ-believers and the Jewish scriptures in his own way. Broadly speaking, the use of common themes and ideas in the writings of Luke and Justin confirms their participation in what we might refer to as a similar form of proto-orthodox Christianity. Yet the differences between their development of these themes also demonstrate that Luke and Justin should not be considered as participants in a monolithic form of “Gentile Christianity” that saw itself as the unequivocal replacement for the Jewish people. Like early Jewish interpreters, both Luke and Justin appropriate the Jewish scriptures, in part, to defend the status of their group as the true people of God. Nevertheless, in the process of asserting this identity for Christ-believers, Justin depicts the non-Jewish church as true Israel and thus heir to the legacy that God originally promised to Jews. By way of contrast, in his configuration of the continuity between the Jewish scriptures and Christ-believers, Luke makes room for an ongoing role for the Jewish people as recipients of the promises that God pledged to Israel.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

- Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *The Greek New Testament*. Fourth Revised Edition. Germany: Biblia-Druck, D-Stuttgart, 1998.
- Bobichon, Philippe. *Justin Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon: Édition critique, traduction, commentaire*. 2 vols. Paradosis 47. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003.
- Colson, F. H. and G. H. Whitaker. *Philo with an English Translation*. 12 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Coxe, A. Cleveland, James Donaldson, and Alexander Roberts, eds. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989.
- Ellinger, K. and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984.
- Falls, Thomas B. *The Writings of Saint Justin Martyr*. The Fathers of the Church. New York: Christian Heritage, 1948.
- Feldman, Louis H. *Judean Antiquities Books 1–4*. vol. 3. Flavius Josephus Translation and Commentary. Edited by Steve Mason. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Grant, Robert M. *Theophilus of Antioch Ad Autolyicum: Text and Translation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Halton, Thomas P. *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho*. Translated by Thomas B. Falls. Revised and with a New Introduction. Edited by Michael Slusser. Washington, DC: Catholic University Press of America, 2003.
- Holladay, Carl R. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: Volume 1: Historians*. Texts and Translations Pseudepigrapha Series 20. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Marcovich, Miraslov, ed. *Athenagoras Legatio Pro Christianis*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990.
- . *Iustini Martyris Apologiae pro Christianis*. Patristische Texte und Studien 38. New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1994.
- . *Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone*. Patristische Texte und Studien 47. New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1997.
- Martínez, Florentino García and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998.
- Metzger, Bruce M., and Roland E. Murphy, eds. *The New Annotated Apocrypha: The Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books of the Old Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Minns, Denis, and Paul Parvis., eds. *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies*. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Munier, Charles. *Saint Justin Apologie pour les chrétiens: Édition et traduction*. Paradosis 39. Fribourg: L'University de Fribourg, 1995.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch: A New Translation Based on the Hermeneia Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.
- Rahlfs, Alfred and Robert Hanhart, eds. *Septuaginta: Editio altera*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
- Stegemann, Hartmut (Editor), Eileen Schuller (Editor), Carol Newsom (Translator). *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayot^a: With Incorporation of 4QHodayot^{a-f} and 1QHodayot^b (DJD XL)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. *Flavius Josephus*. 10 vols. London: Heinemann; New York: Putnam, 1926–1981.

Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Rev. ed. England: Clays Ltd., 2004.

Whittaker, Molly, ed. *Tatian: Oratio ad Graecos and Fragments*. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Albl, Martin C. "And the Scripture Cannot Be Broken": *The Form and Function of Early Christian Testimonia Collections*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 96. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Alexander, Loveday. "Fact, Fiction and the Genre of Acts." *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998): 380–99.

—. "Acts of the Apostles as an Apologetic Text." Pages 15–44 in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Edited by Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price, in association with Christopher Rowland. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Ådna, Jostein. "James' Position at the Summit Meeting of the Apostles and Elders." Pages 125–61 in *The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 127. Edited by Jostein Ådna and Hans Kvalbein. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2000.

Allert, Craig D. *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho*. Vigiliae Christianae Supplements 64. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Allison, Dale C. "Who Will Come from East and West? Observations on Matt. 8:11–12—Luke 13:28–29." *Irish Biblical Studies* 11 (1989): 158–70.

Andresen, Carl. "Justin und der mittlere Platonismus." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 44 (1952–1953): 157–95.

Argall, Randal A. *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation, and Judgment*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature 8. Atlanta: Scholars, 1995.

—. "Pagan and Christian Traditionalism in the First Three Centuries." *Studia Patristica* 25 (1984): 414–31.

Attridge, H. W. *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. Harvard dissertations in religion. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.

—. "Historiography." Pages 157–84 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. vol. 2. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1984.

—. "Josephus and His Works." Pages 185–232 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. vol. 2. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1984.

Aune, David E. "Justin Martyr's Use of the Old Testament." *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 9 (1966): 179–97.

—. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983.

—. "Charismatic Exegesis in Early Judaism and Early Christianity." Pages 126–50 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 14. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth and C. A. Evans. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Baldus, Aloys. *Das Verhältnis Justins des Märtyrers zu unsern synoptischen Evangelien*. Munster, 1895.

Barclay, John M. G. *Against Apion*. vol. 10 of Flavius Josephus Translation and Commentary. Edited by Steve Mason. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Barnard, Leslie W. "The Old Testament and Judaism in the Writings of Justin Martyr." *Vetus Testamentum* 14 (1964): 394–406.

—. *Athenagoras: A Study in Second Century Christian Apologetic*. Théologie Historique 18. Paris: Beauchesne, 1972.

- . *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Barnes, T. D. "The Embassy of Athenagoras." *Journal of Theological Studies* 26 (1975): 111–4.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. ICC. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–1998.
- . "Luke-Acts." Pages 231–244 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honor of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by Donald A. Carson and Hugh G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Barton, John. *Oracles of God: Perception of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986.
- Bauckham, Richard. "James and the Jerusalem Church." Pages 415–80 in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke. vol. 4 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- . "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13–21)." Pages 154–84 in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*. Edited by Ben Witherington III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- . "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus." Pages 43–69 in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 63. Edited by Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts." Pages 435–87 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 72. Edited by James Scott. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Revised and edited by Frederick William Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Baumgarten, Albert I. "The Name of the Pharisees." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102 (1983): 417–22.
- . "The Perception of the Past in the Damascus Document." Pages 1–15 in *The Damascus Document, A Centennial Discovery: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4–8 February, 1998*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 34. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. *Studies in Qumran Law*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 24. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.
- Bayer, Hans F. "The Preaching of Peter in Acts." Pages 257–74 in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Beard, Mary. "Writing and Religion: Ancient Literacy and the Function of the Written Word in Roman religion." Pages 35–58 in *Literacy in the Roman World*. Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series III. Edited by M. Beard et al. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1991.
- Becker, J. *Das Heil Gottes: Heils—und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und in Neuen Testament*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- Bedenbender, Andreas. "The Place of the Torah in the Early Enoch Literature." Pages 65–94 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 121. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Beentjes, Pancratius C. "Prophets in the Book of Chronicles." Pages 45–53 in *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as a Historical Person, Literary Character and*

- Anonymous Artist*. Edited by Johannes C. de Moor. *Old Testament Studies* 45. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- . "Prophets and Prophecy in the Book of Ben Sira." Pages 135–50 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 427. Edited by Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Bellinzoni, A. J. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*. Novum Testament Supplements 17. Netherlands: Brill, 1967.
- Benz, E. "Christus und Sokrates in der alten Kirche." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 43 (1950–1951): 195–224.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "Peshar Habakkuk." Pages 647–50 in vol. 2 of the *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2 vols. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Berrin, Shani L. *The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 53. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . "Qumran Pesharim." Pages 110–33 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by Matthias Henze. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005.
- Betz, O. *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1960.
- . "Past Events and Last Events in the Qumran Interpretation of History." *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies* 6 (1977): 27–34.
- Beuken, W. A. M. "Servant and Herald of Good Tidings: Isaiah 61 as an Interpretation of Isaiah 40–55." Pages 411–42 in *The Book of Isaiah = Le livre d'Isaïe: Les oracles et leurs relectures unité et complexité de l'ouvrage*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 81. Edited by J. Vermeylen. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.
- Bilde, Per. *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works, and Their Importance*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
- Bihler, J. "Der Stephanusbericht (Apg 6,8–15 un 7,54–8,2)." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 3 (1959): 252–70.
- Bingham, D. Jeffrey. "Justin and Isaiah 53." *Vigiliae Christianae* 54 (2000): 248–61.
- Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.
- . *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphica 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Prophecy and Canon: A Contribution to the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.
- . *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988.
- Blomberg, Craig. "The Law in Luke-Acts." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 22 (1984): 53–80.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Partings of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*. Journal for the Study of New Testament: Supplement Series 12. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- . *Luke*. 2 vols. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994–1996.
- . "Scripture and the Realisation of God's Promises." Pages 41–62 in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.

- . *Acts*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.36. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990.
- . "Natural Law in Second Temple Judaism." *Vetus Testamentum* 45 (1995): 17–44.
- . "The Noahide Commandments and New Testament Ethics." *Revue biblique* 102 (1995): 72–101.
- Borgen, Peder. "Philo of Alexandria." Pages 233–82 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Writings, Philo, Josephus*. vol. 2. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1984.
- . *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 86. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Die Evangelienkritik Justins des Märtyrers in ihrem Wert für die Evangelienkritik*. Göttingen, 1891.
- Bovon, François. "The Role of the Scriptures in the Composition of the Gospel Accounts: The Temptations of Jesus (Lk 4.1–13 par.) and the Multiplication of the Loaves (Lk 9.10–17 par.)." Pages 26–31 in *Luke and Acts*. Edited by Gerald O'Collins and Gilberto Marconi. New York: Paulist Press, 1991.
- . *A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50*. Hermeneia. Translated by Christine M. Thomas. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.
- . *Luke the Theologian: Fifty Years of Research (1950–2005)*. 2nd ed. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Bowker, J. "Speeches in Acts: A study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form." *New Testament Studies* 14 (1967–1968): 96–111.
- Brawley, Robert L. *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- . *Text to Text Pours forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.
- Broadie, Sarah. "Rational Theology." Pages 205–24 in *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy*. Edited by A. A. Long. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Brodie, Thomas L. "Towards Unraveling the Rhetorical Sources in Acts: 2 Kings 5 as One Component of Acts 8, 9–40." *Biblica* 67 (1986): 41–67.
- . "Luke-Acts as an Imitation and Emulation of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative." Pages 78–85 in *New Views on Luke and Acts*. Edited by Earl Richard. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990.
- . *The Crucial Bridge: Elijah-Elisha Narrative as an Interpretive Synthesis of Genesis-Kings and a Literary Model for the Gospels*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Brooke, George J. "Justifying Deviance: The Place of Scripture in Converting to a Qumran Self Understanding." Pages 73–87 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange with the assistance of Katie M. Goetz and Susan Bond. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 30. Atlanta: SBL, 2005.
- . "Prophecy and Prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Looking Backwards and Forwards." Pages 151–65 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by Michael Floyd and Robert D. Haak. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 427. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Brown, Raymond E. "Jesus and Elijah." *Perspective* 12 (1971): 85–104.
- . "Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity but Two Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (1983): 74–9.

- . *An Introduction to the New Testament*. New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1996.
- Brownlee, William H. *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran*. Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 11. Philadelphia: SBL, 1959.
- . *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 24. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Bruce, F. F. *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959.
- . *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988.
- Buck, P. Lorraine. "Justin Martyr's Apologies: Their Number, Destination, and Form." *Journal of Theological Studies* 54 (2003): 45–59.
- Bultmann, R. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. Translated by K. Grobel. London: SCM Press, 1955.
- Burkitt, F. Crawford. *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1911.
- Busse, U. *Die Wunder des Propheten Jesus. Die Rezeption, Komposition und Interpretation der Wundertradition im Evangelium des Lukas*. Forschung zur Bibel 24. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1979.
- Cadbury, Henry J. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. New York: MacMillan, 1927.
- . "Subsidiary Points." Pages 349–59 in *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles*. vol. 2. Edited by Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols. London: MacMillan, 1920–1933.
- . *The Book of Acts in History*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.
- Callan, Terrence. "The Background of the Apostolic Decree." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55 (1993): 284–97.
- Campbell, Jonathan G. *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 228. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995.
- Carroll, John T. *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 92. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Cassidy, Richard J. *Society and Politics in Acts of the Apostles*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1988.
- Cerfaux, L. "Citations scripturaires et traditions textuelles dans le livre des Actes." Pages 43–51 in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*. Edited by P. Menoud and O. Cullmann. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestle, 1950.
- Chadwick, Henry. "Justin Martyr's Defense of Christianity." *Bulletin of John Ryland's University Library of Manchester* 47 (1964–1965): 275–97.
- . "Philo and the Beginnings of Christian Thought." Pages 137–57 in *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*. Edited by A. H. Armstrong. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Chance, J. Bradley. *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988.
- Charles, R. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. ICC. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.
- Christensen, T. "Justin og Testimonia Traditionen." *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 84 (1983): 39–62.
- Chung, Yun Lak. "The Word of God" in Luke-Acts: A Study of Lukan Theology." PhD diss., Emory University, 1995.
- Cohen, N. G. "The Greek Virtues and the Mosaic Laws in Philo: an Elucidation of *De Specialibus Legibus* IV 133–35." *The Studia Philonica Annual* 5 (1993): 9–23.

- Collins, A. Yarbro. "Aristobulus: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 831–6 in vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1985.
- Collins, John J. "Jewish Apocalypticism against Its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 220 (1975): 27–36.
- . *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- . "Before the Canon: Scriptures in Second Temple Judaism." Pages 225–41 in *Old Testament Interpretation: Past, Present and Future*. Edited by J. L. Mays, D. L. Petersen, and K. H. Richards. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995.
- . *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1995.
- . "Prophecy and Fulfillment in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 301–14 in *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 54. Edited by John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- . *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. 2nd ed. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000.
- . "Cult and Culture: The Limits of Hellenization in Judea." Pages 38–61 in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 13. Edited by John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- . "The Construction of Israel in the Sectarian Rule Books." Pages 25–42 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity Part 5 Volume 1: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Theory of Israel*. Handbook of Oriental Studies: Section One: The Middle East 56. Edited by Alan J. Avery-Peck, Jacob Neusner, and Bruce Chilton. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. Harper & Brothers: New York, 1960.
- . "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity." Pages 298–309 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- . *Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by James A. Limburg, Thomas Kraabel and Donald H. Juel. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Cooke, G. A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1936.
- Cosgrove, C. H. "Justin Martyr and the Emerging Christian Canon: Observations on the Purpose and Destination of the Dialogue with Trypho." *Vigiliae Christianae* 36 (1982): 209–32.
- Credner, Carl August. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften*. Halle, 1832.
- Croatto, J. Severino. "Jesus, Prophet like Elijah, and Prophet-Teacher like Moses in Luke-Acts." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124 (2005): 451–65.
- Cross, F. M. *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*. Garden City: Doubleday Publishing, 1961.
- Dahl, Nils A. "'A People for His Name'." *New Testament Studies* 4 (1957–58): 319–27.
- . "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts." Pages 139–58 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.

- . *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976.
- Danielou, Jean. *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*. Translated by John Austin Baker. vol. 2 of *A History of Early Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea*. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press, 1973.
- Danker, Frederick W. *Luke*. Proclamation Commentary. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Darr, John A. *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 163. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Davies, Philip R. *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the Damascus Document*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 25. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1983.
- . "'Old' and 'New' Israel in the Bible and the Qumran Scrolls: Identity and Difference." Pages 33–41 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 70. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Dawson, David. *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Denova, Rebecca I. *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 14. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- De Jonge, M. *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and The Greek Life of Adam and Eve*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphica 18. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Dillon, John M. *The Middle Platonists. A Study of Platonism 80 B.C. to A.D. 200*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Dillon, Richard J. *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24*. Analecta Biblica 82. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.
- . "The Prophecy of Christ and His Witnesses according to the Discourses of Acts." *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 544–56.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Qumran Sectarian Literature." Pages 483–550 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Writings, Philo, Josephus*. vol. 2. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum* 2.2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1984.
- Di Lella, Alexander A. and Patrick W. Skehan. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes*. Anchor Bible Commentary Series 39. New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1987.
- Dibelius, Martin. *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by Mary Ling. London, SCM Press, 1951.
- . *The Book of Acts: Form, Style, and Theology*. Translated by Mary Ling. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.
- Doeve, Jan Willem. *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954.
- Doran, Robert. *Birth of a Worldview: Early Christianity in Its Jewish and Pagan Context*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1995.
- Douglas, Michael C. "Power and Praise in the Hodayot: A Literary Critical Study of 1QH 9:1–18:4." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1998.
- Droge, Arthur J. *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 26. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989.
- . "Josephus between Greeks and Barbarians." Pages 115–42 in *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in Its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des

- Urchristentums 34. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Drury, John. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1976.
- Dupont, Jacques. "La parabole du semeur dans la version de Luc." Pages 97–108 in *Apophoreta: Festschrift für E. Haenchen*. Edited by W. Eltester et F. H. Kettler. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche 30. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1964.
- . *Études sur les Actes des apôtres*. Lectio Divina 45. Paris: Cerf, 1967.
- . "Les discours de Pierre dans les Actes et le chapitre 24 de l'évangile de Luc." Pages 328–74 in *Évangile de Luc: Problèmes littéraires et théologiques. Memorial L. Cerfaux*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 32. Belgium: Peeters, 1973.
- . "La portée christologique de l'évangélisation des nations d'après Luc 24, 47." Pages 125–43 in *Neues Testament und Kirche für Rudolf Schnackenburg [z. 60. Geburtsdag am 5. Jan. 1974 von Freunden u. Kollegen gewidmet]*. Edited by Rudolf Schnackenburg and Joachim Gnllka. Freiburg: Herder, 1974.
- . *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by John R. Keating. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
- . *Nouvelles études sur les Actes des apôtres*. Lectio divina 118. Paris: Cerf, 1984.
- . "Un peuple d'entre les nations (Actes 15.14)." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 321–35.
- . "'Je rebâtirai la cabane de David qui est tombée' (Ac 15,16=Am 9,11)." Pages 19–32 in *Glaube und Eschatologie: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 80ten Geburtstag*. Edited by Erich Grässer and Otto Merk. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985.
- Easton, Burton Scott. *Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts, and Other Papers*. London: SPCK, 1955.
- Eddy, Samuel K. *The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334–31 B.C.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.
- Edwards, M. J. "On the Platonic Schooling of Justin Martyr." *Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1991): 17–34.
- . "Justin's Logos and the Word of God." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3 (1995): 261–80.
- Edwards, Mark, Martin Goodman, Simon Price, and Christopher Rowland. "Introduction: Apologetics in the Roman World." Pages 1–13 in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Edited by Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price, in association with Christopher Rowland. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Ehrhardt, Arnold. "Justin Martyr's Two Apologies." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 4 (1953): 1–12.
- Ehrman, B. D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Elliger, K. *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 15. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953.
- Elliot, J. K. ed. *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Ellis, Earle E. *The Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974.
- Emerton, J. A. "A Review of *The Semitisms of Acts*." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 13 (1968): 284–90.
- Engelhardt, M. *Das Christentum Justins des Märtyrers. Eine Untersuchung über die Anfänge der katholischen Glaubenslehre*. Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1878.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

- Esler, Phillip Francis. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: the Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. Society for the Study of New Testament Monograph Series 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Evans, Craig A. *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6:9–10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- . “Old Testament in the Gospels.” Pages 579–90 in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Edited by Joel Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992.
- Evans, Craig A. and James A. Sanders, eds. *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Feldman, Louis H. *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937–1980)*. Berlin: Walter deGruyter, 1984.
- . *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- . “Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus.” Pages 210–39 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by Michael Floyd and Robert D. Haak. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 427. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Finkel, A. “The Peshet of Dreams and Scriptures.” *Revue de Qumran* 4 (1963): 357–70.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- . “Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran.” Pages 339–77 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. *Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 2,1. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- . “Inner-Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel.” Pages 3–18 in *The Garments of Torah: Essays in Biblical Hermeneutics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.
- . “From Scribalism to Rabbinism: Perspectives on the Emergence of Classical Judaism.” Pages 439–56 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible Commentary Series 28–28A. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1981–1985.
- . “The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts.” Pages 524–38 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*, 1992. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- . *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible Commentary Series 31. New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1998.
- Foakes, F. J. and Kirsopp Lake, eds. *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles*. 5 vols. London: MacMillan, 1920–1933.
- Fraade, Steven D. “Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran.” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 44 (1993): 51–63.
- Franklin, Cecil L. “Justin’s Concept of Deliberate Concealment in the Old Testament.” PhD diss., Harvard University, 1961.
- Franklin, E. *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts*. London: SPCK, 1975.
- Fraser, P. M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Frend, William H. C. “The O. T. in the Age of the Greek Apologists A.D. 130–180.” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 26 (1973): 129–50.
- Freudenthal, J. *Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke*. Hellenistische Studien I–II. Breslau: Skutsch, 1875.
- Gamble, Harry. *The New Testament Canon: Its Making and Meaning*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship New Testament Series. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

- Gammie, John G. "The Sage in Sirach." Pages 355–72 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo Perdue. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Gärtner, Bertil. *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation*. Acta seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis 21. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1955.
- Gasque, W. Ward. *A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975.
- . "A Fruitful Field: Recent Study of the Acts of the Apostles." *Interpretation* 42 (1988): 117–31.
- Gathercole, Simon J. *The Preexistent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006.
- Geffcken, Johannes. *Zwei griechische Apologeten*. Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1907.
- George, Augustin. "Israel dans l'œuvre de Luc." *Revue biblique* 75 (1968): 481–525.
- Gerber, Christine. "Die Heiligen Schriften des Judentums nach Flavius Josephus." Pages 91–115 in *Schriftauslegung im antiken Judentum und im Urchristentum*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 73. Edited by Martin Hengel und Hermut Löhr. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. *Memory & Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis 22. Livonia: Dove, 1961.
- Ginzberg, L. H. *Studies in Daniel*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1948.
- Gnilka, J. *Die Verstockung Israels. Isaias 6,9–10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker*. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 3. München: Kösel, 1961.
- Goldingay, John E. *Daniel*. Word Biblical Commentary 30. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- Goodenough, Erwin R. *The Theology of Justin Martyr*. Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923.
- Goodman, Martin. "Josephus' Treatise Against Apion." Pages 48–56 in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Edited by Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price, in association with Christopher Rowland. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. *Die ältesten Apologeten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914.
- Goppelt, L. *Typos: Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen*. Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie 43. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1939.
- Goulder, M. D. *Type and History in Acts*. London: SPCK, 1964.
- . *The Evangelists' Calendar: a Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture*. London: SPCK, 1978.
- Grabbe, Lester L. *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian vol. 2: The Roman Period*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Grant, Robert M. "The Heresy of Tatian." *Journal of Theological Studies* 4–6 (1954): 62–8.
- . *The Letter and the Spirit*. London: SPCK, 1957.
- . *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988.
- Grassi, Joseph A. "Emmaus Revisited: Luke 24, 13–35 and Acts 8, 26–40." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 26 (1964): 463–67.
- Green, Joel B. "The Problem of a Beginning: Israel's Scriptures in Luke 1–2." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 4 (1994): 61–86.
- . *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997.
- Green, Joel B., and Michael C. McKeever. *Luke-Acts and New Testament Historiography*. Institute for Biblical Research Bibliographies 8. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
- Greenberg, Moshe. *Ezekiel 1–20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible Commentary Series 22. Garden City: Doubleday Publishing, 1983.

- Gregory, Andrew. *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 169. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Grelot, Pierre. "Soixante-dix semaines d'années." *Biblica* 50 (1969): 169–86.
- . "Note sur Actes, XIII, 47." *Revue biblique* 88 (1981): 368–72.
- Grether, O. *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 64. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1934.
- Grossman, Maxine L. *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 45. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- . "Cultivating Identity: Textual Virtuosity and 'Insider' Status." Pages 1–11 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 70. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Grübe, K. L. "Die hermeneutischen Grundsätzen Justins des Märtyrers." *Der Katholik* 60 (1880): 139–59.
- Haenchen, Ernst. "Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 51 (1954): 153–67.
- . "Judentum und Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 54 (1963): 155–87.
- . *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Translated by R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
- Hall, Robert G. *Revealed Histories: Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Hamm, Dennis. "Acts 3:12–26: Peter's Speech and the Healing of the Man Born Lame." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 11 (1984): 199–217.
- . "Paul's Blindness and Healing: Clues to Symbolic Intent." *Biblica* 70 (1990): 63–72.
- Hammer, Raymond. *The Book of Daniel*. Cambridge Bible Commentary of the Old Testament. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- . "Elijah and Jesus: A Quest for Identity." *Judaism* 19 (1970): 207–18.
- Hardwick, Michael E. *Josephus as an Historical Source in Patristic Literature Through Eusebius*. Brown Judaic Studies 128. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- . "Contra Apionem and Christian Apologetics." Pages 369–400 in *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in Its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 34. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Harnack Adolf. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Dritte verbesserte und vermehrte auflage*. 3 vols. Freiburg, Leipzig & Tübingen: Mohr, 1894–1897.
- . *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. 2 Theil, 1 Band. *Die Chronologie der Litteratur bis Irenaeus*. Nebst einleitenden Untersuchungen. Leipzig, 1897.
- . *History of Dogma*. 7 vols. Translated by Neil Buchanan. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1896–1905.
- . *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*. 2 vols. Translated by James Moffat. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.
- . *Marcion. Das Evangelium von fremden Gott*. 2nd ed. Texte und Untersuchungen 46. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924. repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1996.
- Hartman, Louis F. and Alexander Di Lella. *The Book of Daniel*. Anchor Bible Commentary Series 23. Garden City: Doubleday Publishing, 1978.
- Hastings, A. *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem: A Study of the Teaching of Saint Luke*. Baltimore: Helicon, 1958.

- Hawthorne, Gerald F. "Tatian and His Discourse to the Greeks." *Harvard Theological Review* 57 (1964): 161–88.
- Hay, David M. "Philo's View of Himself as an Exegete: Inspired, but not Authoritative." *Studia Philonica Annual* 3 (1991): 40–52.
- Heinisch, P. *Der Einfluss Philos auf die älteste christliche Exegese: Barnabas, Justin und Clemens von Alexandria*. Münster: Aschendorffschen Buchdruckerei, 1908.
- Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2nd ed. Translated by John Bowden. 2 vols. London: SCM Press, 1974.
- Hertig, Paul. "The Jubilee Mission of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke: Reversals of Fortunes." *Missiology* 26 (1998): 167–79.
- Heumann, C. A. "Dissertatio de Theophilo cui Lucas Historiam Sacram Inscriptit." Pages 483–505 in *Bibliotheca Historico-Philologico-Theologica*. Classis 4. Bremen: 1720.
- Hilgenfeld, Adolf. *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justins, der Clementinischen Homilien und Marcion's*. Halle, 1850.
- . "Die alttestamentlichen Citate Justin's in ihrer Bedeutung für die Untersuchung über seine Evangelien." *Theologische Jahrbücher* 9 (1850): 385–439.
- Hill, Charles E. "Justin and the New Testament Writings." *Studia Patristica* 30 (1997): 42–8.
- Hirshman, M. "Polemical Literary Units in the Classical Midrashim and Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 83 (1993): 369–84.
- . *A Rivalry of Genius: Jewish and Christian Biblical Interpretation in Late Antiquity*. Translated by Batya Stein. New York: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- . "Rabbinic Universalism in the Second and Third Centuries." *Harvard Theological Review* 93 (2000): 101–15.
- Hofer, A. "The Old Man as Christ in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*." *Vigiliae Christianae* 57 (2003): 1–21.
- Holladay, Carl H. *Theios Aner in Hellenistic Judaism: A Critique of the Use of This Category in New Testament Christology*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 40. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Hollander, H. W. and M. De Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphica* 8. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Holm-Nielson, Svend. *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*. Acta theologica danica 2. Aargus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960.
- Holte, R. "Logos Spermatikos: Christianity and Ancient Philosophy according to St. Justin's Apologies." *Studia Theologica* 12 (1958): 109–68.
- Holtz, Traugott. *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*. Texte und Untersuchungen 104. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968.
- Horgan, Maurya P. *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979.
- Horner, Timothy J. "Listening to Trypho": *Justin Martyr's Dialogue Reconsidered*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 28. Leuven and Paris: Peeters, 2001.
- Horsley, Richard A. "The Law of Nature in Philo and Cicero." *Harvard Theological Review* 71 (1978): 35–59.
- Hughes, Julie A. *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 59. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Hunt, Emily J. *Christianity in the Second Century: The Case of Tatian*. Routledge Early Church Monographs. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Hurtado, L. W. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003.
- Hyldahl, Niels. "Tryphon and Tarphon." *Studia theologica* (1956): 77–88.

- . *Philosophie und Christendom: Eine Interpretation der Einleitung zum Dialog Justins*. Acta theologica danica 9. Kopenhagen: Prostant Apud Munksgaard, 1966.
- Japhat, Sara. *I-II Chronicles: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993.
- Jassen, Alex P. *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 68. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Jeremias, G. *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.
- . *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.
- . *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar) 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 39. Missoula: Scholars, 1977.
- . *The Gospel of Luke*. Sacra Pagina 3. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- . *The Acts of the Apostles*. Sacra Pagina 5. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Joly, Robert. *Christianisme et philosophie: Études sur Justin et les apologistes grecs du deuxième siècle*. Belgique: L' Université de Bruxelles, 1973.
- Jones, Bruce William. "The Prayer in Daniel IX." *Vetus Testamentum* 18 (1968): 488–493.
- Katz, P. "Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll." *Studia Patristica* 1 (1957): 343–53.
- Kemp Lowther Clarke, William. "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts," Pages 66–105 in *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles*. vol. 2. Edited by Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols. London: MacMillan, 1920–1933.
- Keresztes, P. "The Literary Genre of Justin's First Apology." *Vigiliae Christianae* 19 (1965): 99–110.
- Kidd, B. J. *History of the Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922.
- Kilgallen, John J. *The Stephen Speech: A Literary and Redactional Study of Acts 7:2–53*. Analecta Biblica 67. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
- . "The Function of Stephen's Speech (Acts 7,2–53)." *Biblica* 70 (1989): 173–93.
- . "A Rhetorical and Source-traditions Study of Acts 2,33." *Biblica* 77 (1996): 178–96.
- Kilpatrick, George D. "Laos at Luke 2:31 and Acts 4:25, 27." *Journal of Theological Studies* 16 (1965): 127.
- Kimball, Charles A. *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 94. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Kimber Buell, Denise. *Why This New Race: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.
- Kister, M. "Concerning the History of the Essenes." *Tarbiz* 56 (1986): 1–15.
- Kittel, Bonnie. "The Problems of Biblical Language." Pages 48–55 in *The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 50. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Kittel, G. and G. Friedrich. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964–1975.
- Klijn, A. F. J. "Stephen's Speech—Acts VII.2–53." *New Testament Studies* 4 (1957–1958): 25–31.
- Knibb, Michael A. *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

- Knox, John. *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- Kodell, Jerome. "'The Word of God Grew': The Ecclesial Tendency of the Λόγος in Acts 6:7; 12:24; 19:20." *Biblica* 55 (1974): 505–19.
- Koester, Helmut. *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literature 65. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957.
- . "ΝΟΜΟΣ ΦΥΣΕΩΣ: The Concept of Natural Law in Greek Thought." Pages 521–41 in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*. Studies in the History of Religions. Supplement to *Numen* 14. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- . "Early Christian Literature." Pages 551–6 in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*. Edited by Keith Crim. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976.
- . *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. London: SCM Press, 1990.
- Koet, B. J. *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Studiorum Novi Testamenti Auxilia 14. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.
- Kraft, Robert A. "The Multiform Jewish Heritage of Early Christianity." Pages 174–99 in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*. Edited by J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Krenkel, M. *Josephus und Lukas: Der schriftstellerische Einfluss des jüdischen Geschichtschreibers auf den christlichen nachgewiesen*. Leipzig: Haessel, 1894.
- Kugel, James L. "The Messiness of History." Pages 40–51 in *Early Biblical Interpretation*. Library of Early Christianity. Edited by James L. Kugel and Rowan A. Greer. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- Kuhn, Karl A. "Beginning the Witness: The ἀντόπται καὶ ὑπηρεταὶ of Luke's Infancy Narrative." *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003): 237–55.
- . *The Bible As It Was*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang. *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Kümmel, W. G. *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of Its Problems*. Translated by S. McLean and Howard C. Kee. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.
- . *Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by Howard Clark Kee. Nashville: Abingdon, 1975.
- Kurz, William S. "The Function of Christological Proof from Prophecy for Luke and Justin." PhD diss., Yale University, 1976.
- Laato, Antti. "The Seventy Yearweeks in the Book of Daniel." *Zeitschrift für die alt-testamentliche Wissenschaft* 102 (1990): 212–23.
- Lacocque, André. "The Liturgical Prayer in Daniel 9." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 47 (1976): 119–42.
- . *Daniel in His Time*. Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1988.
- Lamberton, Robert. *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*. The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 9. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Lampe, G. W. H. ed. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.
- Lange, Armin. "Reading the Decline of Prophecy... and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 195–201 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 30. Edited by K. de Troyer and A. Lange. Atlanta: SBL, 2005.
- Larkin, William J. Jr. "Luke's Use of the Old Testament in Luke 2–23." PhD diss., University of Durham, 1974.

- . *Acts*. InterVarsity Press New Testament Commentary Series. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1995.
- Laurentin, René. *Structure et théologie de Luc I–II*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1957.
- Levison, John R. "Philo's Personal Experience and the Persistence of Prophecy." Pages 194–209 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 427. Edited by Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Licht, Jacob. *Megillat ha-Hodayot: me-megillot midbar Yehudah*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1956.
- . "The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll." *Israel Exploration Journal* 6 (1956): 1–13, 89–101.
- Liddell, H. G. and R. Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Reprint of the 9th ed. (1925–1940) with a new supplement. Edited by E. A. Barber and others. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Lieu, Judith M. "The Race of God-fearers." *Journal of Theological Studies* 46 (1995): 483–501.
- . *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century*. London, T&T Clark, 1996.
- . *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Lippelt, Ernst. *Quae Fuerint Justini Martyris Quaeque Ratione Cum Forma Syro-Latina Cohaeserint*. Halle, 1901.
- Litwak, Kenneth Duncan. *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 282. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Lohfink, Gerhard. *Paulus vor Damaskus: Arbeitsweisen der neueren Bibelwissenschaft dargestellt an den Texten Apg 9, 1–19; 22, 3–21; 26, 9–18*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 4. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967.
- . *Die Sammlung Israels: Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie*. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments 39. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1975.
- Lohse, E. "Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte." *Evangelische Theologie* 14 (1954): 256–75.
- Loisy, A. F. *Les Actes des apôtres*. Paris: Emile Nourry, 1920.
- . *L'Evangile selon Luc*. Paris: Emile Nourry, 1924.
- Lyman, Rebecca. "Hellenism and Heresy." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 11 (2003): 209–22.
- . "Justin and Hellenism: Some Postcolonial Perspectives." Pages 160–8 in *Justin Martyr and his Worlds*. Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Maddox, Robert. *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*. Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982.
- Mack, Burton L. *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- . "The Structure of Athenagoras, Supplicatio pro Christianis." *Vigiliae Christianae* 23 (1969): 1–20.
- Manns, F. "L'Exegese de Justin dans le Dialogue avec Tryphon." *Analecta* 12 (1977): 130–52.
- Mansoor, Menahem. *The Thanksgiving Hymns*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 3. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1961.
- Marguerat, Daniel. *The First Christian Historian: Writing the 'Acts of the Apostles'*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 121. Translated by Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery and Richard Bauckham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970.

- . "The Resurrection of Jesus in Luke." *Tyndale Bulletin* 24 (1973): 55–98.
- . *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980.
- . "Luke and his 'Gospel'." Pages 289–308 in *Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982 / hrsg. von Peter Stuhlmacher*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 28. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- . *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. repr., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992.
- . "Luke's Portrait of the Pauline Mission." Pages 99–113 in *The Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul's Mission*. Edited by Peter Bolt and Mark Thompson. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- Marshall, J. L. "Some Observations on Justin Martyr's Use of Testimonies." *Studia Patristica* 16 (1985): 197–200.
- Martens, John. "Philo and the 'Higher' Law." Pages 310–22 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1991 Seminar Papers*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 30. Edited by Eugene H. Lovering, Jr.. Atlanta: Scholars, 1991.
- . *One God: One Law: Philo of Alexandria on the Mosaic and Greco-Roman Law*. Ancient Mediterranean and Medieval Texts and Contexts 5. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Martin, François. *Le livre d'Hénoch: Documents pour l'étude de la Bible, traduit sur le texte éthiopien*. Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1906.
- März, Claus-Peter. *Das Wort Gottes bei Lukas: Die lukanische Worttheologie als Frage an die neuere Lukasforschung*. Erfurter theologische Schriften 11. Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1974.
- Mason, Rex. *Preaching the Tradition: Homily and Hermeneutics after the Exile based on the "Addresses" in Chronicles, the Speeches in Ezra and Nehemiah and the Post-Exilic Books*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Mason, Steve. *Josephus and the New Testament*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1992.
- . "The *Contra Apionem* in Social and Literary Context: An Invitation to Judean Philosophy." Pages 187–228 in *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in Its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 34. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- McGehee, Michael. "Why Tatian Never 'Apologized' To The Greeks." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* (1993): 143–58.
- McKnight, Scot. *A New Vision for Israel: The Teachings of Jesus in National Context*. Studying the Historical Jesus 4. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999.
- Meier, John P. "Is There *Halaka* (the Noun) at Qumran." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 75 (1956): 150–5.
- Mendels, D. "Creative History in the Hellenistic Near East in the Third and Second Centuries BCE: The Jewish Case." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 2 (1988): 13–20.
- Menoud, Philippe H. "Le Plan des Actes des Apôtres." *New Testament Studies* 1 (1954): 44–51.
- Menziez, R. P. *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Society, 1998.
- Micheel, Rosemarie. *Die Seher- und Prophetenüberlieferungen in der Chronik*. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie 18. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1983.

- Milik, J. T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*. Studies in Biblical Theology 26. Translated by J. Strugnell. Naperville: Alec Allenson, 1959.
- Milik, J. T. ed. and trans. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Miller, David. "Luke's Conception of Prophets Considered in the Context of Second Temple Literature." PhD diss., McMaster University, 2004.
- Miner, P. S. *To Heal and to Reveal: The Prophetic Vocation according to Luke*. New York: Seabury, 1976.
- Mínguez, Dionisio. "Hechos 8:25–40: análisis estructural del relato." *Biblica* 57 (1976): 168–91.
- Moessner, David P. "'The Christ Must Suffer': New Light on the Jesus—Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts." *Novum Testamentum* 28 (1986): 220–56.
- . "Paul in Acts: Preacher of Eschatological Repentance to Israel." *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 96–104.
- . "The Ironic Fulfillment of Israel's Glory." Pages 35–50 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*. Edited by Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988.
- . *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- . "The Script of the Scriptures in Acts: Suffering as God's 'Plan' (βουλή) for the World for the 'release of sins'." Pages 218–50 in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*. Edited by Ben Witherington III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Moll, Sebastian. "Justin and the Pontic Wolf." Pages 145–51 in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Montague, George T. *Understanding the Bible: A Basic Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. New York: Paulist Press, 1997.
- Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927.
- Moore, Thomas. "The Lucan Great Commission and the Isaianic Servant." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 154 (1997): 47–60.
- Mueller, Christopher. "Leserorientierte Fragen im Erzählwerk des Lukas." *Theologie und Glaube* 93 (2003): 28–47.
- Munck, Johannes. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- . *The Acts of the Apostles*. Anchor Bible Commentary Series 31. Garden City: Doubleday Publishing, 1967.
- Murray, Oswyn. "Hecateus of Adbera and Pharaonic Kingship." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 56 (1970): 141–71.
- Myers, Jacob Martin. *1–2 Chronicles*. Anchor Bible Commentary Series 12–13. Garden City: Doubleday Publishing, 1963.
- Nahm, Charles. "The Debate on the 'Platonism' of Justin Martyr." *Second Century* 9 (1992): 129–51.
- Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 77. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . "Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 30 (1999): 379–410.
- . "The Law of Nature and the Authority of Mosaic Law." *The Studia Philonica Annual* 11 (1999): 55–73.
- Nasrallah, Laura. "Mapping the World: Justin, Tatian, Lucian, and the Second Sophistic." *Harvard Theological Review* 98 (2005): 283–314.
- . "The Acts of the Apostles, Greek Cities, and Hadrian's Panhellenion." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 533–66.
- Nauck, Wolfgang. "Die Tradition und Komposition der Areopagrede." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 53 (1956): 11–52.

- Neudorfer, Heinz-Werner. "The Speech of Stephen." Pages 275–94 in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Studying Classical Judaism: A Primer*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991.
- Newsom, Carol A. *Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 52. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . "Constructing 'We, You, and the Others' through Non-Polemical Discourse." Pages 13–21 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 70. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. "The Epistle of Enoch and the Qumran Literature." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 (1982): 334–40.
- . "Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity." Pages 73–91 in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, and "Others" in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985.
- . "Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture." Pages 333–54 in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual Situational Contexts*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.
- . "The Nature and Function of Revelation in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and Some Qumranic Documents." Pages 91–120 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January 1997*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 31. Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- . *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- . *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Harvard Theological Studies 56. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- . "Polarized Self-Identification in the Qumran Texts." Pages 23–31 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 70. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Nolland, John. *Luke 1–9:20*. Word Biblical Commentary 35a. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Press, 1989.
- . *Luke 9:21–18:34*. Word Biblical Commentary 35b. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Press, 1989.
- . *Luke 18:35–24:53*. Word Biblical Commentary 35c. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Press, 1989.
- Norris, Richard A. Jr. "The Apologists." Pages 36–44 in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*. Edited by Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Oden, R. A. "Philo of Byblos and Hellenistic Historiography." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 110 (1978): 115–26.
- O'Neill, J. C. *The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting*. London: SPCK, 1961.
- O'Reilly, Leo. *Word and Sign in the Acts of the Apostles: A Study in Lucan Theology*. Analecta Gregoriana 243. Rome: Editrice Pontifica Università Gregoriana, 1987.
- Osborn, Eric Francis. *Justin Martyr*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 47. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1973.
- O'Toole, R. F. *The Christological Climax of Paul's Defense (Ac 22:1–26:32)*. Analecta biblica 78. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978.

- . "Activity of the Risen Jesus in Luke-Acts." *Biblica* 62 (1981): 471–98.
- . "Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch (Acts VIII 25–40)." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 17 (1983): 25–34.
- . "Acts 2:30 and the Davidic Covenant of Pentecost." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102 (1983): 245–58.
- Overbeck, F. *Kurze Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte von W. M. L. de Wette, Vierte Auflage bearbeitet und stark erweitert von Franz Overbeck*. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Leipzig, 1870.
- . "Ueber das Verhältniss Justins des Martyrers zur Apg." *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 15 (1872): 305–49.
- Overman, J. Andrew. "The God-fearers: Some Neglected Features." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32 (1988): 17–26.
- Pao, David W. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 130. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Parsons, Mikael C. "Isaiah 53 in Acts 8: A Reply to Professor Morna Hooker." Pages 104–19 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Edited by William H. Bellinger, Jr. and William R. Farmer. Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1998.
- Parsons, Mikeal C. and Martin M. Culy. *Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2003.
- Parvis, Sarah. "Justin Martyr and the Apologetic Tradition." Pages 115–27 in *Justin Martyr and his Worlds*. Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Pattison, S. E. "A Study of the Apologetic Function of the Summaries of Acts." PhD diss., Emory University, 1990.
- Penner, Todd C. *In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan Apologetic Historiography*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Perdue, Leo G. "Ben Sira and the Prophets." Pages 132–54 in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit: Essays in Honor of Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M.* Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 38. Edited by Jeremy Corley and Vincent T. M. Skemp. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2005.
- Pervo, Richard I. *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*. Santa Rosa: Polebridge, 2006.
- . *Acts*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.
- Petersen, David L. *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 23. Missoula: Scholars, 1977.
- Phillips, Thomas E. "The Genre of Acts: Moving toward a Consensus?" *Currents in Biblical Research* 4 (2006): 365–96.
- Plümacher, Eckhard. *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922.
- Polhill, John B. *Acts*. New American Commentary 26. Nashville: Broadman Publishers, 1992.
- Pomykala, Kenneth E. "A Scripture Profile of the Book of the Watchers." Pages 263–84 in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Biblical Interpretation 28. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Porteous, Norman W. *Daniel: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.
- Price, R. M. "'Hellenization' and Logos doctrine in Justin Martyr." *Vigiliae Christianae* 42 (1988): 18–23.
- . "Are there 'Holy Pagans' in Justin Martyr?" *Studia Patristica* 31 (1997): 167–71.

- Prigent, Pierre. *Justin et L'Ancien Testament: L'Argumentation scripturaire du traité de Justin contre toutes les hérésies comme source principale du Dialogue avec Tryphon et de la Première Apologie*. Paris: Lecoffre, 1964.
- Puech, Aimé. *Les apologistes grecs du IIe siècle de notre ère*. Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie., 1912.
- Puech, Émile. "Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and in the New Testament." Pages 235–56 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant. The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- Pycke, N. "Connaissance rationnelle et connaissance de grace chez saint Justin." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 37 (1961): 52–85.
- Rabinowitz, Isaac. "The Second and Third Columns of the Habakkuk Interpretation Scroll." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 69 (1950): 31–49.
- Rajak, Tessa. "Talking at Trypho: Christian Apologetic as Anti-Judaism in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*." Pages 59–80 in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Edited by Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price in association with Christopher Rowland. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- . "Josephus." Pages 585–95 in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought vol. 1: The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Ravens, David. *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 119. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko and Adam H. Becker. "Introduction: Traditional Models and Directions." Pages 1–34 in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Texts & Studies in Ancient Judaism 95. Edited by Annette Yoshiko Reed and Adam H. Becker. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Reed, Annette. "The Trickery of the Fallen Angels and the Demonic Mimesis of the Divine: Aetiology, Demonology, and Polemics in the Writings of Justin Martyr." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* (2004): 141–71.
- . "'Revealed Literature' in the Second Century BCE: Jubilees, 1 Enoch, Qumran, and the (Pre)History of the Biblical Canon." Pages 94–8 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by G. Boccaccini with J. H. Ellens and J. Waddell. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005.
- . *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Reese, Günter. "Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des frühen Judentums: Eine Untersuchung der Tiervision und der Zehnwochenapokalypse des äthiopischen Henochbuchs, der Geschichtsdarstellung der Assumptio Mosis und der des 4 Esrabuches." PhD diss., Ruprecht-Karl-Universität zu Heidelberg, 1967.
- Reise, Martin. *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*. Studien zum Neuen Testament 1. Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1969.
- Richard, Earl. *Acts 6.1–8.4: The Author's Method of Composition*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 41. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978.
- . "The Creative Use of Amos by the Author of Acts." *Novum Testamentum* 24 (1982): 37–53.
- Richardson, P. *Israel in the Apostolic Church*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 10. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Ritschl, Albrecht. *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lukas*. Tübingen, 1846.
- Rius-Camps, Josep and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger. *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition: Volume 1: Acts 1.1–5.42: Jerusalem*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 257. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

- Roberts, J. J. M. "The Hand of Yahweh." *Vetus Testamentum* 21 (1971): 244–51.
- Roberts Gaventa, Beverly. "The Eschatology of Luke-Acts Revisited." *Encounter* 43 (1982): 27–42.
- . *From Darkness to Light: Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament*. Overtures to Biblical Theology. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- . *The Acts of the Apostles*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003.
- Robinson, William C. Jr. "On Preaching the Word of God." Pages 131–8 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. New York: Abingdon Press, 1966.
- Rodway Johnson, Aubrey. *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1962.
- Rogers, P. R. "Acts 2:18, *kai propheteusousin*." *Journal of Theological Studies* 38 (1987): 95–7.
- Rogers, Rick. *Theophilus of Antioch: The Life and Thought of a Second-Century Bishop*. New York: Lexington Books, 2000.
- Rokeah, David. *Justin Martyr and the Jews*. Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 5. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Roloff, Jürgen. *Apostolat-Verkündigung-Kirche. Ursprung, Inhalt und Funktion des kirchlichen Apostelamtes nach Paulus, Lukas und den Pastoralbriefen*. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965.
- Rosner, Brian S. "Acts and Biblical History." Pages 65–82 in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke. vol. 1 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- Rudolph, Anette. 'Denn wir sind jenes Volk...'. *Die neue Gottesverehrung in Justins Dialog mit dem Juden Tryphon in historisch-theologischer Sicht*. Studien zu AltenKirchengeschichte 15. Bonn: Borengrässer, 1999.
- Runesson, Anders. *The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-Historical Study*. Coniectanea biblica New Testament Series 37. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001.
- Runesson, Anders, Donald D. Binder, and Birger Olsson. *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Sourcebook*. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 72. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Runia, David T. *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*. Philosophia Antiqua 2. Leiden: Brill, 1986.
- . *Exegesis and Philosophy: Studies on Philo of Alexandria*. Hampshire: Variorum, 1990.
- . *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*. *Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 3.3. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993.
- . "Philo a Middle Platonist? A Difficult Question Revisited." *The Studia Philonica Annual* 5 (1993): 112–40.
- Sanday, William. *The Gospels in the Second Century*. London, 1876.
- Sanders, J. A. "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4." Pages 75–106 in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 12. Edited by J. Neusner. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.
- Sanders, Jack T. *The Jews in Luke-Acts*. London: SCM Press, 1987.
- Satterthwaite, Phillip E. "Acts Against the Background of Classical Rhetoric." Pages 337–79 in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke. vol. 1 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- Scharlemann, M. H. *Stephen: A Singular Saint*. *Analecta Biblica* 34. Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1968.

- Schechter, Solomon. *Fragments of a Zadokite Work: Documents of Jewish Sectaries* vol. 1. Cambridge, 1910. Reprinted with prolegomenon by J. A. Fitzmyer. New York: Ktav, 1970.
- Scheckenburger, M. *Über den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte: Zugleich eine Ergaenzung der neueren Commentare*. Bern: C. Fischer, 1841.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *The Halakhah at Qumran*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 16. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- . *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. Garden City: Doubleday Publishing, 1995.
- . "The Pharisees and Their Legal Traditions according to the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 8 (2001): 262–77.
- Schmidt, Daryl. "The Historiography of Acts: Deuteronomistic or Hellenistic?" Pages 417–27 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1985 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Kent Harold Richards. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Schneider, Gerhard. *Lukas, Theologe der Heilsgeschichte: Aufsätze zum lukanischen Doppelwerk*. Bonner biblische Beiträge 59. 2 vols. Königstein-Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1985.
- Schnider, F. *Jesus der Prophet*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.
- Schmiedewind, William H. *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 197. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995.
- Schoeps, H. J. *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1949.
- Schubert, P. "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24." Pages 165–86 in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag am 20. August 1954*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 21. Edited by W. Eltester. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954.
- Schürer, E. *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1901–1909.
- . *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. 3 vols. Edited and revised by Geza Vermes, Fergus Miller and Martin Goodman. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1971–1987.
- Schürmann, Heinz. *Das Lukasevangelium*. 2 vols. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 1982–1994.
- Scott, James M. "Acts 2:9–11 as an Anticipation of the Mission to the Nations." Pages 87–123 in *The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles*. Edited by Jostein Ådna and Hans Kvalbein. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Seeligmann, I. L. "Die Auffassung von der Prophetie in der deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtsschreibung." Pages 254–84 in *Congress Volume Göttingen 1977*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 29. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- . "The Beginnings of Midrash in Chronicles," *Tarbiz* 49 (1979–1980): 20–1.
- Seifrid, M. A. "Jesus and the Law in Acts." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 30 (1987): 39–57.
- Semisch, Karl. *Die apostolischen Denkwürdigkeiten des Märtyrers Justinus*. Hamburg, 1848.
- Shelton, J. B. *Mighty in Word and Deed: The Role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Peabody: Hendrikson, 1988.
- Shemesh, Aharon and Cana Werman. "Hidden Things and Their Revelation." *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1998): 409–27.
- . "Halakah at Qumran: Genre and Authority." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10 (2003): 106–12.
- Shotwell, Willis A. *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr*. London: SPCK, 1965.

- Sibinga, J. Smith. *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr*. vol. 1: *The Pentateuch*. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Siker, Jeffrey S. *Disinheriting the Jews: Abraham in Early Christian Controversy*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991.
- . "'First to the Gentiles': A Literary Analysis of Luke 4:16–30." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992): 73–90.
- Silberman, L. "Unriddling the Riddle." *Revue de Qumran* 3 (1961): 323–64.
- Simon, Marcel. "Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 2 (1951): 127–42.
- . *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire, 135–425*. Translated by H. McKeating. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Sjöberg, Erik. "The Restoration of Column II of the Habakkuk Commentary of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Studia theologica* 4 (1952): 120–8.
- Skarsaune, Oskar. "The Conversion of Justin Martyr." *Studia Theologica* 30 (1976): 53–73.
- . *Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 106. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- . "From Books to Testimonies: Remarks on the Transmission of the Old Testament in the Early Church." *Immanuel* 24–25 (1990): 207–19.
- . "Judaism and Hellenism in Justin Martyr, Elucidated from His Portrait of Socrates." Pages 585–611 in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion: Festschriften für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, vol. 3: Frühes Christentum. Edited by Hubert Cancik, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Peter Schäfer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- Skehan, Patrick W. and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. Anchor Bible Commentary Series 39. New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1987.
- Sloan, Robert B. *The Favorable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubiliary Theology in the Gospel of Luke*. Austin: Schola, 1977.
- Smend, R. *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, hebräisch und deutsch*. Berlin: Reimer, 1906.
- Smith, R. M. "The Eschatology of Acts and Contemporary Exegesis." *Concordia Theological Monthly* 29 (1958): 641–63.
- Soards, Marion L. *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- Sparks, H. F. D. "The Semitisms in St. Luke's Gospel." *Journal of Theological Studies* 1 (1950): 16–28.
- Spencer, F. Scott. *The Portrait of Philip in Acts: A Study of Roles and Relations*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 67. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- . *Acts. Readings: A New Biblical Commentary*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Stadelmann, Helge. *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter: Eine Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vor-makkabäischen Sofer unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester-, Propheten- und Weisheitlerertum*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Tübingen: J.C.B Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1980.
- Stanley, Christopher D. "The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method." Pages 44–58 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 148. Edited by C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Stanton, Graham N. *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

- . "Stephen in Lucan Perspective." Pages 345–60 in *Studia Biblica III Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors. Sixth International Congress on Biblical Studies. Oxford, 3–7 April 1978*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 3. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.
- . "Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho: Group Boundaries, 'Proselytes' and 'God-fearers'." Pages 263–78 in *Tolerance and Intolerance in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Graham N. Stanton and Guy G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . "The Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr." Pages 321–34 in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D.G. Dunn*. Edited by Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton. Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004.
- . *Jesus and Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Steck, Odil Hannes. *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 23. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde*. Bonn, 1971.
- . *On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus*. The Library of Qumran. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Sterling, Gregory E. *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 64. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . "Platonizing Moses: Philo and Middle Platonism." *The Studia Philonica Annual* 5 (1993): 96–11.
- . "'Athletes of Virtue': An Analysis of the Summaries in Acts (2:41–47; 4:32–35; 5:12–16)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113/4 (1994): 679–96.
- Steudel, Annette. "אֶחָרִית הַיָּמִים in Texts from Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1993–94): 225–46.
- Steyn, Gert J. *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Act Apostolorum*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995.
- Stowers, Stanley Kent. "Social Status, Public Speaking and Private Teaching: The Circumstances of Paul's Preaching Activity." *Novum Testamentum* 26 (1984): 59–82.
- Strauss, Mark L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*. Journal for the Study of New Testament Supplements 110. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Strelan, Rick. "The Running Prophet (Acts 8:30)." *Novum Testamentum* 43 (2001): 31–8.
- Striker, Gisela. "Origins of the Concept of Natural Law." Pages 209–20 in *Essays on Hellenistic Epistemology and Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Stronstad, R. *The Charismatic Theology of Saint Luke*. Peabody: Hendrikson Publishers, 1984.
- Struck, Peter T. *Birth of the Symbol: Ancient Readers at the Limits of their Texts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "Temporal Shifts from Text to Interpretation: Concerning the Use of the Perfect and Imperfect in the *Habakkuk Pesher* (1QpHab)." Pages 124–49 in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches New Questions*. Edited by Michael Thomas Davis & Brent A. Strawn. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007.
- Stylianopoulos, Theodore. *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 20. Missoula: SBL and Scholars Press, 1975.
- Sukenik, E. L. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1955.

- Talbert, Charles H. *Luke and the Gnostics: An Examination of the Lucan Purpose*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.
- . "Promise and Fulfillment in Lucan Theology." Pages 91–103 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles Talbert. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1984.
- . *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.
- Tannehill, Robert C. "The Mission of Jesus according to Luke 4:16–30." Pages 76–147 in *Jesus in Nazareth*. Edited by Erich Grässer. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972.
- . "Rejection by Jews and Turning to Gentiles: The Pattern of Paul's Mission in Acts." Pages 83–101 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*. Edited by Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988.
- . *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986–1990.
- Taylor, Justin. "The Jerusalem Decrees (Acts 15.20, 29 and 21.25) and the Incident at Antioch (Gal 2.11–14)." *New Testament Studies* 46 (2001): 372–80.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. *The Life, Against Apion*. London: William Heinemann, 1926.
- Tiede, David L. *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- . "The Exaltation of Jesus and the Restoration of Israel in Acts 1." *Harvard Theological Review* 79 (1986): 278–86.
- Tiller, Patrick A. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 4. Atlanta: Scholars, 1993.
- Torrey, C. C. *The Composition and Date of Acts*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916.
- Townsend, John T. "Date of Acts." Pages 47–62 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles Talbert. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1984.
- Trakatellis, Demetrius C. *The Pre-Existence of Christ in Justin Martyr*. Harvard Dissertations in Religion 6. Missoula: Scholars, 1976.
- Trocmé, Étienne. *Le "Livre des Actes" et l'histoire*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1957.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. "The Christology of Luke-Acts." Pages 133–64 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J. Verheyden. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2002.
- Turner, Max. "The Sabbath, Sunday, and the Law in Luke-Acts." Pages 99–158 in *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation*. Edited by D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982.
- . *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness*. Journal of Pentecostal Theological Supplement Series 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Turner, N. "The Quality of the Greek in Luke-Acts." Pages 387–400 in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*. Edited by J. K. Elliot. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Tyson, Joseph B. "The Gentile Mission and the Authority of Scripture." *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 619–31.
- . *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992.
- . *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006.
- van den Eynde, S. "Children of the Promise: on the *διαθήκη*-promise to Abraham in Luke 1,72 and Acts 3,25." Pages 470–82 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J. Verheyden. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2002.
- Van Rooy, Harry V. "Prophet and Society in the Persian Period according to Chronicles." Pages 163–79 in *Second Temple Studies 2: Temple Community in the Persian Period*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 175. Edited by Tamara C. Eskenazi and Kent H. Richards. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.

- Van Winden, J. C. M. *An Early Christian Philosopher: Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho Chapters One to Nine*. Philosophia Patrum 1. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- VanderKam, James C. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 16. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.
- . "Biblical Interpretation in 1 Enoch and Jubilees." Pages 96–125 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 14. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- . *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 62. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "Open and Closed Eyes in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85–90)." Pages 279–92 in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 83. Edited by Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . "Sinai Revisited." Pages 44–60 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Edited by Matthias Henze. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005.
- . "To What End? Functions of Scriptural Interpretation in Qumran Texts." Pages 302–20 in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 101. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . "Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral Law." Pages 465–77 in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 94. Edited by S. M. Paul, R. A. Kraft, and L. H. Schiffman. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Vielhauer, Phillip. "On the 'Paulism' of Acts." Pages 33–50 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.
- Volkmar, G. *Über Justin den Märtyrer und sein Verhältniss zu unsern Evangelien*. Zurich, 1853.
- von Campenhausen, Hans Freiherr. *Formation of the Christian Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- von Rad, Gerhard. "The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles." Pages 267–80 in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- . *Old Testament Theology*. 2 vols. Translated by David Muir Gibson Stalker. New York: Harper & Row, 1962–1965.
- Wacholder, B. Z. *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature*. Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 3. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1974.
- Wanke, J. "Wie sie in beim Brotbrechen erkannten: zur Auslegung der Emmauserzählung Lk 24:13–35." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 18 (1974): 180–92.
- Waszink, J. H. "Some Observations on the Appreciation of the 'Philosophy of the Barbarians' in Early Christian Literature." Pages 41–56 in *Mélanges Offerts à Mademoiselle Christine Mohrmann*. Utrecht: Spectrum, 1963.
- Watson, Frances. *Text and Truth: Re-defining Biblical Theology*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997.
- Weiss, J. *Über die Absicht und den literarischen Charakter der Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897.
- Wendt, H. H. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar, Part 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.
- Weren, W. J. C. "Psalm 2 in Luke-Acts: An Intertextual Study." Pages 189–203 in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas Van Iersel*. Edited by S. Draisma. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1989.
- Werline, Rodney. "The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr's 'Dialogue with Trypho'." *Harvard Theological Review* 92 (1999): 79–93.

- Wernberg-Moller, P. *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 1. Leiden: Brill, 1957.
- Westermann, C. *Isaiah 40–66: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Translated by J. J. Scullion. London: SPCK, 1966.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- . *Ancient Greek Literature*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004.
- . *The Second Sophistic*. Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics 35. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Whybray, R. N. *Isaiah 40–66*. New Century Bible. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1975.
- Widdicombe, Peter. "Justin Martyr, Allegorical Interpretation, and the Greek Myths." *Studia Patristica* 31 (1997): 234–39.
- Wilckens, U. *Die Missionreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 5. Neukirchener Verlag, 1974.
- Wilcox, Max E. *The Semitisms of Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- . "The God-Fearers in Acts: A Reconsideration." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 13 (1981): 102–22.
- Wilk, Florian. "Apg 10,1–11,18 im Licht der lukanischen Erzählung vom Wirken Jesu." Pages 605–17 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J. Verheyden. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2002.
- Willi, Thomas. *Die Chronik als Auslegung*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments 106. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- Williamson, H. G. M. *Ezra, Nehemiah*. Word Biblical Commentary 16. Waco: Word Books, 1985.
- Wilson, Gerald H. "The Prayer of Daniel 9: Reflection on Jeremiah 29." *Journal for the Study of Old Testament* 48 (1990): 91–9.
- Wilson, Stephen G. "Lukan Eschatology." *New Testament Studies* 15 (1969–1970): 330–47.
- . *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- . *Luke and the Law*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 50. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Winter, B. W. "On Introducing Gods to Athens: An Alternative Reading of Acts 17:18–20." *Tyndale Bulletin* (1996): 71–90.
- Witherington, Ben Jr. III. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Wolfson, H. A. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947.
- Wrede, William. *The Messianic Secret*. Translated by J. C. G. Greig. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1971.
- Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1996.
- Young, Frances M. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002.
- Zahn, Theodor. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Band 1. *Das Neue Testament Vor Origenes*. 2 vols. Erlangen, 1888–1892.
- Zeller, E. *Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihrem Inhalt und Ursprung kritisch untersucht*. Stuttgart: C. Macken, 1854.
- Zöckler, O. *Geschichte der Apologie des Christentums. Nebst einem Verzeichnis der literarischen Veroeffentlichungen des heimgegangenen Verfassers*. Gütersloh, 1907.

INDEX OF ANCIENT TEXTS

OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis		23:20–21	117
1:1–2	148	24:9–10a	52
1:3	117	34:28	46
1:6	117		
1:9	117	Leviticus	
1:22	168	23:29	113, 191
1:26–28	204	25	239
1:28	168	25–26	47
8:17	168	25:8–12	256
9:1	168	26:9	168
9:7	168	26:14–39	46
9:24–27	228	27	239
11:31–12:3	219		
12:2	171	Numbers	
12:3	222, 223, 224	5:21	46
15:6	234	16:9	220
15:7	219	21:18	73
15:13–14	219, 220, 221	24:17	267
15:14b	219		
17:4	233, 234	Deuteronomy	
17:20	168	4:29–30	35
18:18	223	8:19	220
22	255	9:9	46
22:18	171, 222, 223, 224	12:2	220
25:22	39	12:30	39
26:4	223	13:3	220
28:3	168	18:11	39
35:11	168	18:15	113, 191
39:21	196	18:15–16a	113
42:23	66	18:18	191
47:27	168	18:19	113, 191
48:4	168	21:22–23	196
49:10	187	23:1	161, 162
		24:16	228
Exodus		28:10	263
1:7	168	28:15–68	46
3:12	219	29:28	72
3:14–15	105	31:7–8	35
4:22–23	255	32:8	148
7:16	220	32:8–9	213
7:26	220	32:16–23	178, 232
12:19	182	32:20	234
14:31	52	32:28	74
15:25b–26	52	32:43	230
18:15	39		
19:11	52	Joshua	
20:11	148	1:7–8	35

Joshua (<i>cont.</i>)		22:13	36, 39
5:2	251	22:18	39
22:27	220	23:22	37
23:7	220		
24:14	220	1 Kingdoms	
		15:24	109
Judges		2 Kingdoms	
3:20	109	12:9	109
		14:17	109
1 Samuel		23:2	109
28:7	39	24:11	109
2 Samuel		3 Kingdoms	
7:12–13	259, 262	12:22	109
7:13	265	12:24	109
7:16	265	13:20	109
7:26	265	16:1	109
12:9	109		
18:21–26	60	4 Kingdoms	
21:2	46	7:1	109
24:11	109	9:36	109
		15:12	109
1 Kings		20:16	109
8:27	148, 230	20:19	109
12:22	36	24:2	109
14:5	39		
15:9–24	34	1 Chronicles	
17–18	115	10:13	36, 39, 109
17:8–24	112	10:14	39
17:9	115	11:3	36, 109
17:17–24	241, 242	11:10	36, 109
18	115	12:19	33
18:2	115	12:24	109
18:5	115	15:13	39
18:12	115	15:15	36
18:46	115	17:3	34, 109
22:5	36, 39	17:12	265
22:7	39	17:14	265
22:8	39	17:24	265
22:19	36	21:9	34
		21:30	39
2 Kings		22:8	36, 109
1:2	39	22:10	265
1:3	39	25:5	109
1:6	39	28:8	39
1:16	39		
3:11	39	2 Chronicles	
3:15	38	6:18	230
4	242	7:14	263
5:1–14	241, 242, 243	7:19	220
5:1–19	112	11:2	36, 109
8:8	39	12:7	36, 109
17	188	15:1–7	34
17:7–20	192		

2 Chronicles (*cont.*)

15:1-8	33, 34, 35, 112
15:2	35
15:2-4	35
15:4-7	35
15:5b	35
15:7	35
18:4	36, 39
18:6	39
18:7	39
18:18	36, 109
19:2	34
19:11	36
20:14-17	33
24:17-22	33
30:12	36
32:31	66
34:21	36, 39
34:26	39
34:30	37
35:6	109
35:20-22	33
36:5	109
36:14-16	192
36:21	36, 109
36:22	36

Ezra

7	2, 39
7:6	37
7:6-10	37, 38, 112
7:9	38
7:10	37, 38
7:12	37
7:14	37
7:25-26	37
7:28	38

Nehemiah

7:65	39
8	2, 39
8:1-8	39
9	188
9:7	219
9:26	192

Esther

2:3	162
2:14	162
4:4-5	162

Job

33:23	66
-------	----

Psalms

2:7	244, 255, 266
5:9	201
10:7	201
14:2	148
14:2-3	201
15	259
15:8-11	259, 262
16:10	244
18:7	178
21	104, 117, 118, 119
21:3	105
21:4	104
21:5-8	118, 119
22	105
33:6	117
45:2	37
67:19	271, 272, 275, 276
71:1-20	178
71:17	171
71:17b	171
107:3	218
107:20	110, 196
107:21	196
109:1	259
109:1-4	171, 204
109:3	123
110:1	123
119:45	39
119:94	39
119:155	39
131:11	259, 262
140:3	201

Proverbs

8	117
8:17	148

Ecclesiastes

1:13	39
7:20	201

Isaiah

1:2-4	253
1:3	202
1:3-4	178
2	171, 174, 177, 178
2:1	109
2:2	258
2:2-4	171
2:3	109, 178
2:3-4	116, 174, 175
2:5-6	274
3:9-11	202

Isaiah (<i>cont.</i>)		43:10–12	160
3:9–15	202	43:12	165
3:10	229	43:27	66
5:18–20	202	44:2	255
5:18–25	202	44:3	256
5:21	185, 276	44:8	165
6:9–10	166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 181, 186, 194	48:20	160
6:10	158, 170, 178, 180, 181	49:6	159, 160, 162, 164, 165, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 182, 210, 236, 243, 244, 246, 250, 251, 252, 256
7:10–16	203		
7:14	203, 204		
8:9	160	49:6–7	247
8:11	38	49:6b	163
8:19	39	51:1	273
11:1	267	51:1–2	216
11:1–3	266, 267, 268, 275	51:4–5	180, 249
11:2	267	52:4	196
11:2–3	268, 269	52:10	236
14:1	182	52:15	178
19:3	39	53:1	178, 202
19:24–25	252, 253	53:7–8	94
25:6–9	218	55:3	178, 244
27:11	74	55:3–5	178, 180, 181
28:14	109	55:3b	244
29:13	178, 198, 201, 204	55:4–5	174
29:13–14	178, 199–200	55:6	148
29:14	178, 199, 200, 252	56	162
32:15	256	56:3–5	161, 162
32:15a	161	56:3–6	161
34:16	39	57:1–4	202
38:4	109	57:19	260
39:5	109	58:6	238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 256, 266, 267
39:8	109		
40–55	159, 238	58:6b	83, 111
40–66	174	59:7–8	201
40:3	31, 77, 157	61	238, 239
40:3–5	236, 246	61:1	196, 239, 243
40:5	170, 237	61:1–2	83, 111, 238, 240, 241, 242, 243, 256, 266, 267
40:5a	237		
41:8	255		
42	255	62:11	160
42:1	255	62:12	232
42:1–4	253, 254, 273	65:1	148, 180
42:1–6	161	65:1–2	180
42:5	148	65:1–3	178, 179, 180, 202
42:6	164, 174, 250	65:2	202
42:6–7	159, 164, 165, 172, 173, 174, 198, 210, 236, 237, 246, 247, 251, 252, 254	65:2–3	180
		65:8–12	254
		65:9	253
		65:9–10	274
42:7	165	65:9–12	273, 274
42:19–20	199	66:1–2	148, 229
43:7	263		
43:10	160, 165		

Jeremiah		2:47	59
1:2	109	4:6	59
2:13	178, 204	4:9	59
3:16	168	7:15–16	48
9:19	109	8:5	48
10:23	68, 69	8:15–17	48
14:9	263	8:19	148
15:17	38	8:27	48
21:2	39	9	45, 46, 55, 78
23:21	60	9:1–2	45
23:29	60	9:2	45, 47, 109
25:11–12	45	9:3	46
29:10	45	9:4–10	45
29:13	148	9:4–19	46
29:13–14	35	9:11	46
31:16	35	9:11–14	45
31:27	252, 253	9:13	48
31:31–32	180, 249	9:15–19	46
37:7	39	9:19	263
38:31	173, 174	9:20–27	46
		9:22	47, 48
Ezekiel		9:23	47, 48
1:3	38	9:23–25	48
3:14	38	9:25	47, 48
3:22	38	10:2–3	46
8:1	38	10:11	48
11:19	256	11–12	54, 78
14:3	39	11:10	49
14:7	39	11:22	49
14:10	39	11:26–27	49
14:20	228	11:30	48
18:4–20	228	11:30–31	49
20:1	39	11:32–33	48
20:3	39	11:33	48, 49, 157
20:31	39	11:33–35	49
20:32	220	11:35	48, 157
33:4	170	11:35–36	49
33:5	170	11:40	49
33:22	38	11:45	49
36:12	252, 253	12:1–4	49
36:26–27	258	12:3	48, 49, 157
36:26–37	256	12:4	48
36:27	39	12:7	49
37:1	38	12:9	48
37:14	256, 258	12:9–10	49
40:1	38	12:10	48, 157
		12:12	49
Daniel		Hosea	
1:17	48	1:1	109
2:4–5	59	1:2	109
2:18	59	3:4	35
2:19	59	4:1	109
2:27	59	5:15	46
2:29	59		
2:30	48, 59		

Joel		4:2	109
1:1	109	6:1	109
2:28–29	267		
3	258, 259, 260, 271,	Habakkuk	
	272	1:5	57, 170
3–4	260	2:2	60
3:1	258, 260, 271, 272		
3:1–2	256, 271, 272, 273,	Zephaniah	
	276	1:1	109
3:1–4	258	1:6	39
3:1–5	258, 259, 260, 262,	2:5	109
	271		
3:2	257	Haggai	
3:2a	271	1:1	109
3:5	192, 258	1:3	109
3:5a	259, 260	2:10	109
3:5b	260	2:20	109
Amos		Zechariah	
3:9	35	1:1	109
5:1	109	1:7	109
5:25–26	229	2:11	232
7:16	109	4:6	109
8:11–12	109	4:8	109
8:12	46	6:9	109
9:11	262, 264, 265	7:1	109
9:11b	265	7:4	109
9:11–12	262, 263, 264, 265,	7:8	109
	276	8:1	109
9:12	262, 263, 265	8:9–11	35
		8:18	109
Jonah		9:1	109
1:1	109	11:11	109
3:1	109	12:1	109
		12:10	267
Micah		Malachi	
1:1	109	1:1	109
4	171, 174, 177, 178	4:2	267
4:1–7	116, 175, 176, 178		

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

1QpHab		6:16	60
1:16–2:10	56, 57–58, 102	7	78, 157
2:1–2	60, 61	7:1–2	59
2:1–10	58, 60	7:1–5	58, 60, 102
2:2–3	58	7:1–5a	58–59
2:3–4	60	7:1–8	29
2:6	60	7:2	59
2:8	57, 58	7:3	60
2:8–10	57	7:4	59
2:9	188	7:10–12	61
5:8–12	61	11:6–8	61
6:15	60		

1QS		10:10-18	62, 157
1-2	188	10:13	67
1:7-9	76	10:13-16	67
1:12	75	10:15	67
1:16-17	75	10:18	67
3-4	214, 217	10:28	66
5	76, 78, 214	10:31	66, 67
5:7b-11	75	11:3-18	61
5:7b-13	76	11:22	66
5:7b-13a	75	12	78
5:8-9	76	12-13	78
5:8-10	76	12:5-29	102
5:8-11	76	12:6	62, 65, 66, 157
5:8-12	29, 107	12:6-11	65
5:8-25	188	12:6-30	62, 69
5:9	76	12:6-30a	62, 62-65
5:10-11	76	12:6-13:4	62
6:6-8	76	12:7	65
6:13-15	76	12:8	66
6:13-27	188	12:10-11	66
8	78, 188, 214	12:11	66, 67
8:11	77	12:12	67
8:11-16	31, 157	12:14	67
8:11b-16a	76-77	12:14b-18a	67
8:12-16	31	12:15	67
8:14-15	77	12:16	67
8:14-16	76	12:19	67
8:15	77	12:24	65
8:15-16	29, 77, 107	12:25	65, 66
9:13	77	12:26	66
9:17-19	76	12:27	62, 157
		12:28	66
4QpPsa		12:28-29	66
1-10.iv.8	61	14:13-14	66, 157
		15:19-26	62, 157
1QH ^a		15:26-27	66
4-9	61	15:29-36	61
5:8-9	65	15:37-16:4	61
5:19-21	68	17:31	65
6:8-9	68	17:31-32	62, 157
6:10-15	66	18-26	61
6:12	68	18:2-9	68
6:12-13	68	18:14-15	66
7:15-16	69	18:27-28	68
7:15-16b	69	18:30	66
7:25-26	68	19:4	66
7:25-26b	62	19:10	66
7:25b-26a	68	19:12-14	66, 157
8:1-10	66	19:12-17	68
9:19	68	19:17	65
9:21	65, 66	19:27-28	68
10-17	61	19:28	66
10:3-19	67	20:11-13	66
10:10	67	20:13-14	68

1QH ^a (<i>cont.</i>)		5:15b-6:11a	72-73
20:19	68	5:16	74
20:20	66	5:16-17	74
20:32-34	65	5:17	74
20:33-34	68	5:21-6:1	74
21:4-5	68	6:1-11a	74
23:5-7	65	6:3	74
		6:3-9	72
CD		6:7	74
1-3	214	6:9	74
1:3-13	188	6:14	74
1:4	71	7:10-21	72
1:11	74	7:17-18	188
1:18	67	13:2-3	76
2-3	78	20:32	74
2:14-15	70		
2:14-3:17	70, 71, 72	1Q28a	
2:14-6:11a	70	1-2	188
2:17-3:1	70		
3:2-3	70	4Q169	
3:4-11	71	23 iii 10	67
3:12b-17a	71	3-4 i 2	67
3:13-14	71	3-4 i 7	67
3:13b-14	72	3-4 ii 2	67
3:14	71	3-4 ii 4	67
3:16	72	2-4 iii 3	67
4:8	74	2-4 iii 7	67
5-6	78		

APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

1 Enoch		91:12-19	188
1-36	49	92-105	217
82:1-4	51	93:1-2	50, 54
85-90	52, 78, 188	93:1-10	188
85:1-2	50, 54	93:2	50, 51
89:28	52, 53	93:8-9	214
89:32-34	52	93:5	51
89:41	52	93:8	51
89:44	52	93:8-9	51
89:51-58	52	93:8-10	50-51
89:54	52	93:10	51, 52
89:54-58	52	93	78
89:59	52	98:9-10	55
89:74	52	98:14-16	55
90:2	52	99:2	55
90:6	53	99:10	55
90:6-10a	53	104:12-13	51
90:6-38	214		
90:9-10	53	4 Ezra	
90:20-38	53	5:13	46
90:30-41	214	5:20	46
90:35-36	53		

Joseph and Aseneth		38:34c–39:3	42
8:10	174	39:1–11	41–42
15:12	174	39:4–5	42
		39:6	42, 43
1 Maccabees		39:6–8	42
2:42	54	39:8b	43
7:12–14	54	39:9–11	43
		48:12	43
2 Maccabees		Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs	
14:1	54	<i>T. Lev.</i>	
15:12	183	14.3–4	174
		18.6–7	267
4 Maccabees		18.6–9	267
1:1	131	18.9	174
1:17	131	19.1–2	174
4:1	183		
7:9	131	<i>T. Jud.</i>	
		24	267
Psalms of Solomon		24:2–3	267
1:4	160		
		<i>T. Ash.</i>	
Sirach		1:3–6:3	217
24	39		
24:1–22	39		
24:23–34	40	Tobit	
24:33	41, 43	5:14	183
38:34b–39:11	41		

NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew		8:11	218
1:22	19	8:11–12	226, 227, 228
2:5	19	8:17	19
2:15	19	9:21	256, 266
2:17	19	10:1–4	190
2:23	19	11:4–6	241
3:7–10	215	11:5	181
3:9	273	11:12–15	270
3:11	267	11:25–27	104
3:11–12	256	11:27	103, 104, 105
3:13–17	255, 267	12:1–14	190
3:16	266	12:17	19
3:17	266	12:18b–20a	253
4:12	256, 266	12:50	183
4:14	19	13:3–23	88
4:17	89	13:3b–8	4
5:17–48	19	13:11	166
5:28	4	13:13	166
6:1	4	13:14–15	166
6:19–20	4	13:16–17	104
7:13–14	217	13:18–23	167
7:22–23	226	13:19	182
8:5–13	218	13:23	182

Matthew (<i>cont.</i>)		1:1-2	86
13:35	19	1:1-4	10, 86, 106, 143
13:53-58	89, 256, 266	1:2	85
14:36	256, 266	1:5-2:52	10
15:6	110	1:6	149
15:9	204	1:13-17	111
16:14	108	1:17	143, 256, 263
20:17-19	92	1:21	263
21:4	19	1:26-38	111
22:16	190	1:31-33	143
22:30	4	1:32	265
22:41-45	123	1:35	108, 256
25:14-30	88	1:50	245
25:41	226	1:46-55	108, 111, 143
26:54	19	1:54-55	215, 256
26:56	19	1:55	221
26:68	108	1:59	229
27:9	19	1:67-79	108
28:19-20	91	1:67-80	111
		1:68	263
Mark		1:68-71	265
1:7-8	256	1:68-79	143
1:9-11	255, 267	1:69	108
1:10	266	1:69-75	215
1:11	266	1:70	256
1:14	256	1:72	221
1:14a	256, 266	1:72-73	216, 256
1:14-15	89	1:72-75	220
2:23-3:6	190	1:74	220
3:10	256, 266	1:77	263
3:35	183	1:78	123
4:3-8	4	2:11	108
4:10-20	88	2:21	229
4:11	166	2:21-24	149
4:12	166	2:25-32	108, 236
4:13-20	167	2:26	108
4:20	182	2:27	149
6:1-6	89	2:29-32	236
6:1-6a	256, 266	2:29-35	111
6:15	108	2:30-32	108, 143, 235, 246
7:7	204	2:31	236
7:13	110	2:32	164, 236, 237, 263
8:28	108	2:34-35	246
9:32	92	2:37	220
10:32-34	92	2:39	149
12:14	190	3-23	9, 10
12:31-33	149	3:1-6	246
12:35-37	123	3:4-6	111, 143, 235
14:65	108	3:6	170, 236
16:19-20	91	3:7-8	246
		3:7-9	215, 234
Luke		3:8	216, 273
1-2	108, 165	3:8b	216
1:1	8, 20, 85	3:10	216

Luke (<i>cont.</i>)		5:12-16	109, 150
3:10-14	216	5:12-26	242
3:12	216	5:14-15	149
3:14	216	5:17	256, 266
3:15	263	6:1-5	111, 150
3:15-18	256	6:1-11	143, 150, 190
3:16	256, 259, 267	6:5	150
3:18	263	6:6	84
3:21-22	255	6:6-11	109
3:22	108, 109, 255, 266	6:17	242
4	111, 115, 183	6:17-49	109
4-7	242	6:18-19	242
4:1	109, 256	6:19	256, 266
4:14	109, 242, 243, 256,	6:20-49	242
	266	6:23	193, 194, 202
4:14-15	241	6:26	193, 202
4:16	83	6:47	84
4:16-18	196, 237	7	242
4:16-20	83, 111	7:1	263
4:16-21	92, 108, 238, 239,	7:1-10	109, 242
	241, 243, 255	7:9	242
4:16-27	111	7:11-16	109
4:16-30	83, 84, 89, 109,	7:11-17	108, 242
	111, 143, 183, 190,	7:16	108, 263
	241, 242	7:17	242
4:16-31	235, 237, 256	7:19a	241
4:18	109, 111, 243	7:20	241
4:18-19	196, 241, 243, 266	7:21-22	241, 242
4:18-20	242	7:22	181, 241, 242
4:18-21	266	7:22b	241
4:19	239	7:26-30	111
4:21	111, 241	7:29	263
4:22	84, 239	7:51-56	109
4:22-23	112	7:57-62	108
4:23	240	8:4-15	110
4:23-28	239-240	8:4-18	88
4:24	108, 112	8:5	123
4:24-27	112, 241	8:5-8	4
4:25-27	108, 240, 242	8:9-10	111
4:27	108	8:9-21	109
4:27-28	190	8:10	166, 168, 169, 181,
4:31-32	84		182, 183
4:31-36	109	8:10-15	182
4:31-37	242	8:10b	166
4:31-44	241	8:11	84, 109, 110, 123,
4:31-7:22	241		167
4:32	84	8:11-15	182
4:36	84, 266	8:12	84
4:38-40	242	8:13	84
4:38-41	109	8:15	84
4:40-41	242	8:19-21	182, 183
4:42-44	242	8:21	84, 109, 110, 183
4:44	84, 242	8:46	256, 266
5:1	84, 109, 110	8:47	263

Luke (<i>cont.</i>)		13:35	8, 111
9:1-6	104	14:1-6	150, 190
9:7-9	109	16:16	108, 270
9:8	108	16:16-17	108
9:19	108	16:17	270
9:20	108	16:31	264
9:26	84	17:11-19	150, 195
9:28	84	17:14	149
9:28-36	109	18:18-25	111
9:35	108	18:27	7
9:44	84	18:28-30	183
9:45	89, 92, 93	18:31-32	89
10:1-12	104	18:31-33	92, 99
10:17-20	103	18:31-34	92, 93, 111
10:17-24	104, 123	18:33	264
10:19	4	18:34	92, 93
10:21	104	19:10	123
10:21-22	104	19:11	144
10:21-24	103, 115	19:11-27	88
10:22	104, 105	19:38	111
10:22-24	115	19:41-44	8, 190
10:25-28	149	19:41-46	111
10:25-37	111	19:45-47	190
10:33-37	195	19:47	190
10:39	84	19:48	190
11:25-37	143	20:1	190, 263
11:28	84, 109, 110	20:1-7	190
11:29-32	111	20:9	263
11:37-54	190	20:9-19	111, 143, 190
11:48	193, 194, 202	20:19	190
11:49-50	190	20:20-25	111
11:51	111	20:21	190
12:48b	4	20:26	190
12:49-51	123	20:27-39	143
12:49-53	109	20:27-40	111, 190
13	227	20:35-36	4
13:1-9	217	20:41-44	111, 123, 143, 190
13:10	84	20:45	263
13:10-17	150, 190	21:5-33	111, 190
13:22-24	217	21:14	144
13:22-30	217, 227, 234	21:20	8, 190
13:23	217	21:22	190
13:24	218	21:33	84
13:25-30	217	21:37	190
13:26	226, 227	21:38	190
13:27	218	22:35-38	111
13:28-29	218	22:41-44	123
13:28-30	218	22:64	108
13:29	218, 228	22:66	263
13:29-30	111	22:69	111
13:31-35	170, 190, 202	23:4	127
13:32-33	190	23:5	242
13:33	108	23:13-16	127
13:33-34	109, 194	23:13-25	190, 191

Luke (<i>cont.</i>)		1:4-8	256
23:18	191	1:5	256
23:20-22	127	1:8	93, 157, 159, 160,
23:21	191		161, 195, 197, 235,
23:23	191		255, 256
23:28-31	111	1:8-9	97
23:46	4	1:15-20	143
23:56	149	1:15-26	111
24	93, 94, 99, 100,	1:22	160
	165	2	14, 261, 262
24:7	264	2-3	114, 191
24:13-35	94	2-5	108
24:13-53	10, 89	2:1-4	261
24:16	92	2:4	257, 261, 271
24:19	84, 108, 263	2:11	261, 271
24:25-27	6, 90, 91, 92, 94,	2:14-21	257-258, 259
	95, 111, 143	2:14-40	111
24:27	94	2:14-42	259
24:31	92	2:17	8, 258, 259, 260,
24:36-43	160		261, 271, 272
24:36-49	6	2:17-18	272
24:43-47	94	2:17-21	271, 272
24:44	84, 92, 99, 160	2:17-36	84, 94, 143, 157,
24:44-46	90		191, 271
24:44-47	91, 93, 94, 95, 143,	2:17-39	273
	165	2:18	257, 259, 261, 271,
24:44-48	91		272
24:44-49	90-91, 94, 111,	2:21	191, 192, 259, 260
	157, 159, 235	2:22	84, 108, 109
24:45	92, 160	2:22-23	246
24:46	94, 264	2:22-36	93, 262, 265
24:46-47	90, 160, 196	2:23	93, 190
24:47	159	2:23-32	259
24:48	93, 160, 161	2:24	264
	197	2:25-32	259
24:48-49	255	2:29	146
24:49	93, 161, 256, 258,	2:32	160, 264
	259	2:33	256, 258, 259, 261
24:49-53	97	2:33-35	123, 259
		2:34	259
John		2:34-35	259
2:13-24	19	2:34-36	259
2:17	91	2:36	259
2:22	91	2:37-41	190
5:39-46	19	2:38	261
7:19	19	2:39	256, 258, 260, 271,
7:49	19		272, 273
12:16	19, 91	2:39a	258
20:9	19, 91	2:39b	260
		2:40-41	84
Acts		2:41	84, 110, 168, 187,
1:1-11	6, 89		190
1:4	256	2:41-47	149
1:4-5	258, 259	2:47	263, 275

<i>Acts (cont.)</i>			
3	14, 115	5:17-42	109, 145
3:1-11	109	5:30	143, 221
3:9	263	5:30-32	246
3:11	263	5:32	109, 160
3:11-26	111, 143, 191	5:42	109
3:12	263	6	185
3:12-26	84, 112	6-7	143
3:13	143, 221	6:1-5	84, 85
3:14	229	6:2	84, 109, 110
3:14-15	190	6:3	109
3:15	160	6:4	84, 85
3:15-17	246	6:6-7	219
3:15-18	114	6:7	84, 109, 110, 167,
3:17	209		219
3:17-19	191	6:8	109, 256
3:17-26	93, 94, 112-113,	6:8-14	109
	157, 191	6:8-7:60	145
3:18	94	6:11	150, 192
3:19-24	114	6:13	150
3:22	113, 114, 191, 264	6:13-14	192, 219
3:22-23	108, 109, 114, 191,	6:14	150
	192, 246	6:23	193
3:23	191, 192, 263	6:26	193
3:24-26	115, 256	7	192, 201, 218, 228,
3:25	223		229, 232
3:25-26	222, 223, 246	7-8	165
3:25a	223	7:1-53	111, 143, 194
3:25b	223	7:2	193, 221
3:26	113, 114, 223, 224,	7:2-4	219
	264	7:2-53	143, 234
4	185	7:5	219
4:1	263	7:6-7	219, 220, 221
4:1-22	109, 145, 190	7:8	222, 229
4:2	263	7:9-16	192
4:4	84, 168	7:11	193, 221
4:8	109	7:12	193, 221
4:8-12	111	7:15	193, 221
4:10	263	7:17	220, 263
4:13	109, 146	7:19	193, 221
4:17	263	7:22	144
4:21	263	7:22-53	109
4:25-31	143	7:32	221
4:27-28	190	7:34	263
4:28	93	7:37	108, 264
4:29	109, 146, 190	7:37-38	144
4:30	109	7:38	193, 201, 221
4:31	84, 109, 110, 146	7:38-39	192
4:32-35	149	7:39	193, 221
5	185	7:39-43	220-221, 230
5:12	263	7:42	221
5:12-16	109, 149	7:42-43	229
5:13	263	7:43	221
5:14	187	7:44	193, 221
		7:44-50	221

Acts (<i>cont.</i>)		10:37	242
7:45	193, 221	10:37–41	196
7:46	221	10:38	109, 243, 256, 266
7:48	230	10:38a	196
7:48–50	201	10:38b	196
7:49ff	158	10:38c	196
7:49–50	229	10:39	160, 196
7:51	194, 202, 222, 229	10:39–42	197
7:51–53	192, 193, 194, 202, 221	10:39–43	197
		10:41	160, 264
7:52	222, 229	10:42	196
7:53	150, 194, 201, 202	10:43	243
7:54–60	109, 194	10:43a	196
7:55	109	10:44	84
8	115, 162	10:45	261
8–11	195	10:46	261
8:1–24	195	10:47	197, 261
8:4	84, 109	10:47–48	261
8:6	109	11:1	84, 109, 110
8:12	109	11:1b	197
8:14	84, 109, 110	11:15	197, 261
8:24	95	11:17	261
8:25	84, 109	11:19	84
8:26	115	11:20	109
8:26–40	93, 94, 111, 115, 143, 161, 195	11:24	109
		12:4	263
8:27	161, 162	12:15	146
8:29	96	12:24	84, 109, 110, 167
8:30	115	13	84, 165, 170, 185, 243
8:30–31	95		
8:30–34	94	13:5	84, 109, 110, 168
8:30–35	95	13:7	84, 109, 110
8:30b	95	13:9	109
8:31a	95	13:13–41	92, 94, 185, 244
8:34	162	13:13–42	143
8:35	94, 96	13:13–52	84, 111, 143
8:36	96, 162	13:15	84, 168
8:38	162	13:16	245
8:39	115, 162	13:16–41	93, 163, 244
8:40	109	13:17	193, 194, 221, 244, 263
9	84		
9:15	165	13:23	244
10	243, 261	13:26	84, 163, 168, 245
10–11	162, 261	13:26b	245
10:1	245	13:26–27	123
10:22	245	13:27	114, 209
10:33b	196	13:27–28	186
10:34	197	13:27–29	94
10:34–43	93, 94, 111, 143, 195, 196	13:31	160
		13:31–35	170
10:35	245	13:32	109, 257
10:36	84, 109, 123, 196, 243	13:32–33a	245
		13:33b–41	244
10:36–38	196, 197, 243	13:34b	244

<i>Acts (cont.)</i>		16:14b	92
13:38	244, 246	16:32	84, 109, 110
13:38-39	150	17	10, 147, 149, 185
13:41	170	17:1ff	84
13:42-47	185	17:1-3	111
13:42-52	109	17:1-8	145
13:44	84, 109, 110, 163,	17:1-9	109
	168	17:3	264
13:44-45	243	17:4	186
13:46	84, 109, 110, 163,	17:10-12	111
	168, 170, 245	17:11	84, 110, 168
13:46-47	143, 157, 159, 162,	17:11-12	186
	165, 169, 170, 185,	17:12	186
	197, 235, 237, 243,	17:13	84, 109, 110, 168
	244	17:16-34	146
13:46-49	163	17:17	147
13:47	158, 160	17:17-18	147
13:47b	163	17:18	147
13:48	84, 109, 110, 168	17:19	146, 147
13:48-49	84	17:20	147
13:49	84, 109, 110, 168	17:22-31	127, 147
13:50	186, 197	17:24	148
14	185	17:24-25	148
14:1ff	84	17:25	148
14:2	186, 197	17:26	148
14:3	84, 109	17:26-27	148
14:4-5	186, 197	17:27	148
14:7	109	17:28	148
14:8-19	146	17:29-31	149
14:15-18	127	17:31	264
14:25	84	18	84, 170
15	162, 197, 262, 263	18:1-6	109, 111
15:7	84	18:4	185, 186, 197
15:7b	197	18:4ff	84
15:7-9	197	18:4-6	185
15:8	197, 261	18:4-8	185
15:10	143, 150, 193	18:5	84, 110, 168
15:12	109	18:5-6	143, 197
15:14	162, 195, 260, 263	18:6	169, 170, 185
15:14-18	262	18:11	84, 109, 110, 168
15:14-21	263, 265	18:12-17	145
15:15-17	111	18:13-15	145, 150
15:15-18	262	18:18	186
15:16	262, 264, 265	19:8	84
15:16b	265	19:8-10	84, 111, 149, 168
15:16-17	265	19:9	185
15:16-18	264, 265	19:10	84, 109
15:17	265	19:10-20	186, 197
15:18-21	143	19:20	84, 109, 110, 167
15:35	84, 109	19:33	144
15:36	84, 109	20:7	84
16:3	229	20:32	84
16:5	275	20:35	84, 109
16:6	84	21:20	149

<i>Acts (cont.)</i>		26:24	144, 146
21:20–28	150	26:24–29	143
21:21–26	229	26:25–26	146
21:24	149	26:26	146
21:30	263	26:30–32	127, 145
22:1	144	27:23	220
22:1–21	145	28	170, 192, 240
22:3	143	28:2	143
22:12	149	28:17	143, 150
22:14	143, 145, 193, 194,	28:20	246
	221	28:23	168
22:15	160, 165	28:23–25	93
22:20	160, 187, 261	28:23–28	109, 111, 143, 169,
22:28	144		185, 194
22:30	145	28:24	169, 185, 186
22:30–23:10	144	28:24–25	168
23:10	145	28:25	194, 202
23:1–10	145	28:25–27	194
23:28	127	28:25b–27	169
23:29	150	28:25–28	166, 169, 170, 185,
23:30	145		195, 197, 246
24:1–21	145	28:26ff	158
24:1–23	144	28:26–27	166, 169
24:5–21	143	28:27	170
24:10	144	28:26–28	168, 170
24:10–22	145	28:28	185, 197, 237
24:14	143, 149, 220	28:31	109, 146
24:24–25	144		
24:27	145	<i>Romans</i>	
25:6–12	144	1:1–12	19
25:8	150	2:17–20	174
25:8–12	127	3:11–17	201
25:16	144	3:21–22	19
25:18–22	145	4	234
25:26–27	145	4:13–25	234
26:1	144	4:17	234
26:1–32	144, 145	6–8	234
26:2	144	10:19	232
26:2–23	145	10:20–21	180
26:4–11	143	11:1–4	275
26:6	143, 145, 193, 194,	11:27	173
	221, 257	15:4	19
26:6–7	246	16:25–26	19
26:7	220		
26:12–23	157, 159, 163, 164	<i>1 Corinthians</i>	
26:16	160, 165	2:6–16	19
26:16–18	237	3:16–17	264
26:17	237	10:11	19
26:17–18	235	11:25	173
26:19–23	111	12	275
26:22	145	12:10b	275
26:22–23	93, 94, 165	12:28	275
26:22–29	145, 146	15:3–4	19
26:23	165, 235, 236, 237		

2 Corinthians		1 Timothy	
3:6	173	2:9	146
3:12-18	19	2:15	146
3:14-15	173		
6:16	264	2 Timothy	
		3:15-16	19
Galatians			
3	234, 274	Hebrews	
3:8-9	234	7:22	173
3:10-13	141	8:6	173
3:14	274	8:8-10	173
3:19-28	274	10:16	173
3:28-29	234	12:24	173
5	234	13:15-16	264
		13:20	173
Ephesians			
2:3	237	1 Peter	
2:20-22	264	2:5	264
4:8	271	4:17	264
1 Thessalonians		Revelation	
1:9	234	3:12	264
		11:1-2	264

PHILO AND JOSEPHUS

Philo		1.56-59	132
<i>Abr.</i>		3.217-219	116
13	131	4.61	132
47-49	132	4.133-135	132
<i>Aet.</i>		<i>Legat.</i>	
17-19	132	156	132
		245	132
<i>Cher.</i>		<i>Mos.</i>	
27	132	1.18-29, 48	131
27-29	132	1.21-24	144
48	132	1.66	116
		1.66	132
<i>Contemp.</i>		2.8-11	132
25-26	132, 149	2.11	133
28	132, 149	2.14	133
67	132	2.27.44	174
69	132	2.45-65	132
89	132	2.48-52	133
		2.49-51	144
<i>De Migr. Abr.</i>		2.216	132
47-49	132	2.250-252	132
		2.280-281	132
<i>Her.</i>			
214	132	<i>Mut.</i>	
		15	116
<i>Leg.</i>			
1.108	132		

<i>Opif.</i>		2.291	131
3	133	3.84	131
171d-172	133	3.223	130
		4.180	131
<i>Prob.</i>		4.185	131
46-47	133	4.328	131
57	132	5.118	131
67	132	7.158	131
80	132, 149	8.34	131
		8.42	131
<i>Q.E.</i>		8.167	131
2.19	133	10.193	131
2.42	133	10.266-281	130
		11.1-3	130
<i>Somn.</i>		11.331-339	130
1.228-230	116	13.171-173	131
2.127	132	15.371	131
2.252	132	18.12-20	131
<i>Spec.</i>		<i>B.J.</i>	
2.61-62	132	3.351-354	129
3.1-6	132	3.400-402	129
		4.312	129
<i>Virt.</i>		<i>C. Ap.</i>	
175	174	1.6-14	130
Josephus		1.29-37	130
<i>A.J.</i>		1.54	131
1.18	131	1.93-154	136
1.18-24	130	1.216	130
1.18-25	144	2.135-136	130
1.20	131	2.148	130
1.125	131	2.149-156	131
1.154-168	130, 131	2.167-168	131
1.156	131	2.168	131
1.238	131	2.257	131
2.7	131	2.281	131
2.205	144	2.281-286	131
2.210	144	2.182	130
2.216	144	2.282-284	130
2.219	131	2.293-295	130
2.224	144		
2.229	131	<i>J. W.</i>	
2.229-231	144	2.119	149
2.236	144	2.162-166	131

JUSTIN MARTYR

<i>1 Apologies</i>		4.7-8	141
1.1	141	5	137
2.1	141	5.1-4	120
2.2	141	5.3-4	120
3.2-3	141	7.3	137
3.3	141	8.1-5	137

1 Apologies (cont.)

10.1	141	38.1	117
12.5	141	38.1-8	119
13.6	121	39.1-3	174, 175, 250
15.1	4	39.1-4	138, 183
15.4	4	39.1-5	157
15.11	4	39.2-4	6
15.15	4	39.3	116, 176, 177, 184
15.17	4	39.3-4	177
16.9-13	227	40.1	86
17.4	4	40.5	179
19.6	7	40.7	184
20.1-5	137	41.5	179
20.1-22.6	137	42	203
21.1	117, 118	42.3-4	184
22.1-6	137	43.1-2	138
23.1	87, 117, 118	44.8	138
23.1-2	138	44.8-10	122, 138
23.1-3	122	44.8-11	121, 140
23.2	105, 141	45	138
23.2-3	117	45.1	86
23.3	141, 268	45.1-6	176
26.5-6	248	45.2-4	171
26.6	137	45.5	157
30-53	106	46.2	105
30.1	87	46.2-3	121
31-35	138	46.2-5	120
31-53	87	47-48	230
31.1-32.14	138	47-49	229
31.2-5	117, 204	47-53	138
31.5	184, 186-187, 187	47.1	86
31.5-7	184	48.1	86
31.7-8	184, 187	48.4	86
32	187	49.1	202
32.4	184	49.1-3	178
32.8	119	49.1-5	178-179, 184, 198,
32.10	118, 268		202
33.1	86	49.1-7	184
33.1-2	138	49.5	6, 88, 95, 97, 98,
33.1-6	117		138, 176, 179, 184
33.1-9	140	49.6	86
33.5	100	50.1	86
33.6	268	50.12	6, 88, 89, 90, 97,
34.1	86		98, 99, 176
35.1	86	51.6	86
36.1-2	117	51.8	86
36.1-3	119, 138	52.3	117, 157
36.3	184	52.7	86
36.3-37.1	178, 198	53.1-3	138
36.3-37.9	202	53.3-12	184
37-40	138	53.5-8	184
37.1	184	53.6-12	184
37.1-2	253	53.7-8	184
37.3-8	229	54-55	122
		54.1-55.8	138

1 Apologies (cont.)

54.5	138	3.4	138
56.1-4	138	3.6	101
57.1	138	4.1	101, 102, 255
58.1-2	248	7.1	101, 255
58.1-3	138	7.1-2	139
59	122	7.1-3	99-100, 172
59-60	138	7.2	102, 139
59.1	86, 138	7.3	100, 101, 102
59.1-60.11	122	8.1	100, 101
60.8	86	8.1-2	139
62-63	116	8.2	138, 139
62.1	138	8.4	270
60.1-2	140	10	106
63	105, 202	10.1	249
63.1-3	184, 202	10.3	247
63.1-17	117, 120	10.4	248, 249
63.2	105	10-12	247
63.5	116	10-47	88, 247
63.10	202	11	180
63.10-16	117	11.1	249
63.11	105	11.1-5	249
63.12-15	202	11.2	249
63.15	105, 116	11.2-3	248-249
64.1	138	11.3	173, 174, 249
64.5	117	11.4	184, 235, 249, 251, 252
66.3	4, 100	11.4-5	249-250, 252
67.3-4	4	11.4-12.2	184
		11.5	213, 229, 234, 235, 254
		12	158
		12-108	247
		12.1-2	178, 180-181, 184
		12.1-3	198, 251, 252
		12.2-3	184
		12.3	230, 251
		14.2-3	251
		14.3	87, 251
		14.8	117, 157
		16.2	229, 230
		16.4	229
		16.4-5	202
		17.1-2	202
		17.2	229
		18.2	201, 230, 251
		18.2-3	251
		18.5	229
		19-24	158
		19.4	229
		19.5	230
		19.5-6	229
		20.4	229
		21.1	230
		22	229
<i>2 Apologies</i>			
2.16	141		
3.2	141		
6.1-3	117		
6.3	121		
6.3-5	118		
7.3	121		
8.1	121		
8.1-3	120		
8.3	121		
9.2	120		
10.4-8	120, 121		
10.7-8	117, 119		
10.8	121		
13.1-3	137, 140		
13.1-6	120, 121		
13.3	121, 122		
13.4	122		
13.5	121		
13.5-6	119		
15.5	141		
<i>Dialogue with Trypho</i>			
1-8	13, 139		
2.1-2	138		

<i>Dialogue with Trypho (cont.)</i>		43.1	229, 230, 251
22.1	86	43.1-2	251
22.1-3	229	43.2	229
22.2	230	43.4	179
22.3-4	229	43.4-7	203
22.11	201, 229	43.8	203
23.3	100	44.1	224
23.4-5	235	44.1-2	225
23.5	235	44.2	140, 201, 225, 230
24	250	44.4	225
24.1	174	45.3	201, 251
24.1-2	251	45.4	117
24.1-3	178	46.3-4	229
24.3-4	178, 184, 198	46.5	201, 230, 251
25-26	228	46.6	251
25.5	230	46.7	231, 251
25.7	87	47.1-4	229
26.1	229, 251	47.2	201, 251
27.1-3	201	47.5	252
27.2	251	48	116
27.3	184, 201	48-108	88
27.3-4	200-201	48.1-3	117, 118
27.4	178	48.2	204
27.5	229	49-51	268, 269
28.2	88	49-52	269
28.2-3	229, 251	49.1	270
28.3-5	251	49.2	117, 157
29.2	1	49.3	116
30.1	100, 172	49.3-5	270
30.2	87	49.7-8	117
30.3	231	49.8	87
31.2	87	50.2	87
31.7	87	51.1	87, 116
32.2	117, 184	51.2	117
32.5	178, 184, 185, 200	51.3	270
32.6	87	52.1	117
33.1	178	52.4	117
33.2	229	53.5	6, 88, 89, 90, 97,
34.1	184		98
34.1-6	178, 184, 198	53.5-6	176
34.3	87	55.2	87
34.7-8	251	55.3	184
36.1	117, 157	56	116
37.3	87	56-64	116
38.2	87, 184, 204	56.3	87
39	158, 267	56.4	87, 116
39.1	275	56.6	86
39.1-5	184, 185	58	116
39.2	184	58.1	100, 101, 172
39.2-4	274, 274-275	58.1-2	104
39.4	86	59-60	116
39.5	276	60.2	116
40.4	117	60.5	87
41-42	117	61-62	117
41.2-3	184, 185	61.1	116, 117, 118

<i>Dialogue with Trypho (cont.)</i>		87.4	266
61.4	251	87.5	185, 271
61.10	251	87.5-6	269-270
62.1	87	87.6	8, 270-271
62.2-3	184	88.1	185, 266, 270
62.2-4	204	88.2	266
62.3	87	88.3	4, 266, 267
62.4	86, 87, 116, 117, 118	88.3-4	268
		88.4	268
62.5	87	88.8	266
64.1	185	90-91	117
64.4	87	91	104
67.4	201	92.1	100, 172
67.7	87	92.1-5	229
67.8	229, 230	92.2	230
67.10	141, 201	92.2-3	229
68.7	117, 184, 204	92.2-4	251
69.2	138	91.3	252
69.4	87	92.3-4	251
70.1	138	92.3-5	230
71.1	117, 204	92.4	185, 230, 251
73.1	87	92.5	87
73.6	229	92.6	87
75	116, 117	93	158
75.1	117	93.1	141
76.3-5	226, 227, 228	93.1-4	251
76.4	226	93.2	252
76.6	4, 6, 88, 89	93.3	87
76.6-7	98, 176	93.4	229
77.3	185	93.4-5	184
77.4	87	93.5	184
78.10-11	100, 101, 172, 178, 184, 185, 198, 199-200	95.1-2	141
		96.1-2	184
		97	117
78.11	200	97.3	117
79.3	87	98-106	104, 117
81.4	4	100.1	105
82.1	185, 270	100.1-2	104-105, 117, 120
83.1	184, 204	100.2	100, 105, 116, 172
83.1-4	171	100.4	4, 100
85.6	87	101	105
85.7	86	101.1-3	117, 118
85.8	87	101.3	4, 86, 100
86	116	102.4	87
86.1	86	102.5	4, 86, 100
86.3	87	102.6	229
87	267, 268, 269, 274, 275	103	105
		103.2	119
87-88	116	103.6	4, 100, 266
87.2	87, 117, 118, 266, 267-268, 275	103.8	4, 100
		104	105
87.3	86, 87, 266, 268, 269	104.1	4, 100, 119
		104.1-2	86
87.3-4	271	105	105

<i>Dialogue with Trypho (cont.)</i>		118.2	117
105.1	4, 100, 118, 268	118.3-4	178
105.1-6	86	119	231
105.2-3	119	119.1	100
105.3	117	119.1-2	178, 232
105.5	4, 100	119.2	229
105.6	4, 100	119.2-3	231
106	105	119.3	213, 229
106.1	4, 6, 89, 90, 99, 100	119.4	232, 233, 234
106.1-2	4	119.5-6	233-234
106.1-4	86	119.6	234, 235
106.3	4, 100, 119	120	171
106.4	4, 100	120.4-5	184
107	105	120.5	117, 184, 204
107.1	4	120.5-6	226, 227, 228
108.1-3	185	120.6	228
108.1-109.3	184	121-123	251
108.2	229	121.1	171
108.2-3	229	121.1-3	171
109-140	251	121.1-4	172, 184, 251
109-142	88	121.2-3	183
109.1	116, 176, 177	121.3	117, 157, 178
109.1-110.2	175, 176, 184	121.3-122.6	157
109.1-110.3	183, 250	121.4	172, 182
109.1-110.6	157	121.4-122.1	181-182
109.3	177	121.4-122.5	198
109.4	171	121.4-123.2	247
110.1-2	178, 184, 203	122	172
110.2	117, 157, 177	122-135	249
110.2-3	177, 252	122.1	87
110.2-4	251	122.1-6	184, 252
110.3	87, 177, 178	122.1-123.4	183, 184, 254
110.4	177	122.3-5	173
110.5	117	122.5	249, 266
110.6	138	123	252
111-115	117	123.1	213
111.1	117	123.2-3	184, 252
111.4	231	123.2-4	178, 184, 198-199
112.2-4	184, 203	123.4	200
113	116	123.5-6	252-253, 254
113-114	117, 251	123.6	213
113.1	184	123.7	253
113.1-114.5	251	123.7-9	250
113.6-7	229	123.8	213
114.1	87, 202	123.8-9	247, 253, 253-254
114.2	203	123.9	251, 254
114.2-5	184, 198	124.1	213
114.3	184, 203	125.1	4, 184
114.3-4	229	125.1-2	88
114.4	251	125.3	268
114.4-5	203	125.3-5	225, 253
114.5	178, 203	125.5	213
116.3	213	126	116
117.1-3	184	126-129	116
117.4	87, 184	126.1-2	184

<i>Dialogue with Trypho (cont.)</i>		134.6	253
126.6	87	135	274
127.1-3	116	135.1-3	253, 254, 273
127.3-5	116	135.1-6	273
128.4	116, 268	135.3	213, 247, 250, 254
129.1	87	135.4-6	274
129.2	87	135.4-136.2	254
129.4	116, 117, 118	135.5-6	213
130.1	87	136.1-3	198
130.1-4	184, 230	136.2	253
130.2	230	136.2-3	184, 202
130.3	213, 231	136.3	229
130.3-4	230-231	137.1	87
130.4	231, 251	137.1-2	251
131-133	158	137.3	229
131.1	87	138.2	116, 119
131.2	185, 229, 251, 252	138.2-3	213
131.4	229	138.3	234
132	117	139-140	228
132.2	229	139.3	86
133.1	229	139.5	234
133.1-2	229	140	117
133.1-5	202	140.1-2	178, 184, 198, 204
134	117	140.3	228
134.1-2	184	140.4	226, 228
134.2	203	141.2	87
134.4	213	142.1	87

OTHER EARLY CHRISTIAN SOURCES

Aristides		6.6	90
<i>Apol.</i>		15.128	90
2	90		
Athenagoras		Didache	
<i>Leg.</i>		10.2	264
7.3	134		
9.1-2	134	Epiphanius	
		<i>Panarion</i>	
		I.3.46	134
1 Clement			
29.2	213	Epistle of the Apostles	
36.1-2	19	19	89
45.2	19	30	89
53.1	19	31	89
Clement of Alexandria			
<i>Stromateis</i>		Epistle of Barnabas:	
1.23	129	1.5-8	19
1.14.59	148	4.11	264
1.19.91	148	6-10	212
1.22.150.4	140	6.8-15	19
1.41.1-4	129	6.15	264
1.53.4	129	9.3-9	19
1.154.2-3	129	14.5-8	247
		14.6-7	173

Epistle of Barnabas: (<i>cont.</i>)		<i>Sim.</i> 9	264
15-16	212	<i>Sim.</i> 94.1-4	90
16.1-10	264	<i>Sim.</i> 102.2	90
Epistle to Diognetus		Tatian	
11.5	19	<i>Or.</i>	
12.1-3	19	1-3	134
		8-11	134
Eusebius		13.3	134
<i>H.E.</i>		15.1	134
3.9.4	130	16-19	134
4.3.1-3	125	20.2	134
4.18.2	125	22-28	134
4.26.1-2	125	25.3	135
5.5.5	125	26.3	135
5.17.5	125	29.1-2	134, 135
7.32.16-18	129	30.1	135
		31.1	135
<i>P.E.</i>		32.1	135
8.7.21	130	35.1	135
8.9.38-8.10.17	129	35.2	135
9.7.1	140	36.2	135
9.26	129	42.1	135
10.6.15	130		
13.12.1-16	129	Theophilus	
		<i>Ad Auto.</i>	
<i>Chron.</i>		1.14	136
12	134	2.9-10	136
		2.10	135
Ignatius		2.12	135
<i>Eph.</i> 9.1	264	2.14	136
		2.30	135, 136
Jerome		2.33	135, 136
<i>Ep.</i> 70.3	130	2.34-35	135, 136
<i>De vir. Ill.</i> 13	130	2.37	135
<i>Adv. Iov.</i> 2.14	130	3.1	136
		3.9	136
Origen		3.9-10	136
<i>C. Cels.</i>		3.11	136
1.16	130	3.16-17	136
4.11	130	3.16-30	135, 136
4.51	140	3.18	135
		3.20	136
Shepherd of Hermas		3.20-25	136
<i>Vis.</i> 3	264	3.26	135, 136
		3.29	136

RABBINIC SOURCES

b. Sanhedrin		<i>Mekilta de R. Ishmael</i>	
34a	60	Tractate of Amalek	
		Exod 17:8-16	174
m. Avot			
1.12	174	<i>Sifre</i> Lev. 18:1-5	174
3.12-13	174	<i>Sifre</i> Num. 18:20	174

OTHER ANCIENT SOURCES

Aratus		Euripides	
<i>Phaenomena</i>		frg. 968	148
5	148		
Aristotle		Herodotus	
<i>N.E.</i> 10.6.1	131	8.105	162
Cicero		Lucian	
<i>De.Rep.</i>		<i>Deor.Conc.</i>	
3.33	133	1.1	146
<i>De orat.</i>		<i>Demonax</i>	
1.13	146	3	146
<i>De rep.</i>		11	147
1.2.2	146	Plato	
<i>De. Leg.</i>		<i>Phaedo</i>	
1.18–19	133	66 a 8	138
<i>Off.</i>		<i>Rep.</i>	
3.69	133	449a	148
<i>Tusc.Disp.</i>		<i>Gorgias</i>	
1.28.68–69	148	457d	148
Dio Chrysostom		485D	146
<i>Discourse</i>		<i>Apology</i>	
34	146	19b	148
<i>Or.</i>		23b	148
45.1	146	24B–C	147
66.25	146	Plutarch	
Diogenes Laertius		<i>De curios</i>	
<i>Lives of Philosophers</i>		516B	146
1.112	149	<i>Quadomondo Adulator</i>	
7.168–169	146	71E	146
Epictetus		Seneca	
<i>Diss.</i>		<i>Consol. Ad Polyb</i>	
1.4.32	131	13.3	146
1.29.36	146	<i>Ep.</i>	
1.29.55–57	146	68.2	146
2.12.17	146	Virgil	
2.13.24–26	146	<i>Georg.</i>	
4.7.6	148	1.237–238	148
<i>Corpus Hermeticum</i>		Xenophon	
4.1	148	<i>Memorabilia</i>	
		1.1.10	147

